United Nations

FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.11

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
27 October 2014

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Forty-first session
Lima, 1–8 December 2014

Item 5 of the provisional agenda
Work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of nationally appropriate mitigation actions

Report on the second workshop under the work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing country Parties

Note by the secretariat

Summary

This report provides a summary of the second workshop under the work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) by developing country Parties. The workshop was held in Bonn, Germany, on 5 June 2014, during the fortieth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation. The workshop provided a space to discuss the benefits of sharing technical information on NAMAs, as well as to share experiences with seeking and providing support for NAMAs.

GE.14-19238 (E)

1419238

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–4	3
	A. Mandate	1–2	3
	B. Organization of the workshop	3–4	3
II.	Summary of proceedings	5–22	3
	A. Segment one: more information on nationally appropriate mitigation actions	5–7	3
	B. Segment two: support for preparing and implementing nationally appropriate mitigation actions	8–16	4
	C. Segment three: the extent of matching of nationally appropriate mitigation actions with support for nationally appropriate mitigation actions	17–22	7

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP) established, at COP 18, a work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) by developing country Parties under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), with a view to facilitating their preparation and implementation.[1]

2. At the same session, the COP decided that this work programme should start in 2013 and end in 2014, and should include focused interactive technical discussions, including through in-session workshops, with input from experts and submissions from Parties and observer organizations.[2]

B. Organization of the workshop

3. The second workshop under the work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs took place during SBI 40, on 5 June 2014, in Bonn, Germany.

4. The workshop was co-chaired by Ms. Ann Gan (Singapore) and Mr. Dimitar Nikov (France). It was divided into three segments:

(a) The first segment focused on information on NAMAs, including assumptions and methodologies;

(b) The second segment addressed support for preparing and implementing NAMAs and provided a space for Parties to share related experiences;

(c) The third and final segment focused on the extent of the matching of NAMAs with support, as reflected in the NAMA registry.

II. Summary of proceedings

A. Segment one: more information on nationally appropriate mitigation actions

5. In the first segment, the co-chairs suggested a discussion on the basis of the following questions:

(a) What are the benefits of sharing information relating to NAMAs? Has the work programme contributed to delivering these benefits?

(b) What challenges are faced by developing countries when generating this information? How could the secretariat assist them?

6. In response to the first question, participants highlighted the usefulness of the work programme as a platform for sharing information and best practices on NAMAs and support for them. It was mentioned that the workshops have provided a space to receive updated information on what is happening at the country level. Several participants provided information on the implementation of NAMAs in their countries, including on the many benefits derived from cooperation with agencies and organizations that provide

[1] Decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 19.
[2] Decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 20.

support for NAMAs. One participant also highlighted the benefits of the regional workshops organized by the secretariat where detailed information on NAMA-related opportunities and challenges is shared by those directly involved in action on mitigation.

7. Parties highlighted the following challenges:

(a) Setting up measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems and developing baselines, which is complicated by the diversity of the actions and differences in national contexts;

(b) Establishing the right institutional arrangements. One participant suggested that, owing to their specificity, each NAMA may require arrangements tailored to the specific context and type of action;

(c) Getting support from the highest levels of government and involving stakeholders, including the private sector;

(d) Obtaining clear information on sources of support available for NAMAs;

(e) Dealing with the variety of requirements identified by the different support sources.

B. Segment two: support for preparing and implementing nationally appropriate mitigation actions

8. The second segment consisted of presentations on experiences with obtaining support for NAMA preparation and implementation. It was opened with an introductory keynote by a representative of the United Nations Environment Programme Risoe Centre, followed by a panel composed of representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Azerbaijan country office and the NAMA Facility, and delegates from Colombia and Mexico.

9. The introductory keynote provided an overview of NAMAs and support sources listed in the NAMA registry and touched on the following :

(a) Available information in the registry includes:

(i) Thirteen requests for support for NAMA preparation totalling USD 1.3 million, all in the form of grants. Not all the requests indicate a domestic component of support for the preparation. Financial support is mainly requested for consultancy fees, MRV, preliminary studies and an analysis;

(ii) Twenty-eight requests for support for NAMA implementation totalling USD 5 billion. Support is requested in the form of grants, loans and guarantees. The financial support is mainly requested for developing and implementing policies and regulatory frameworks, investments, measures to create an attractive investment environment, as well as for capacity-building, awareness-raising and technology transfer;

(iii) Nine support entries, mainly for NAMA preparation. Some of the support is accessible by all the countries, while some of the initiatives target specific regions (e.g. European Union–Africa Infrastructure Trust Fund). The amount of financial support made available by each source is not specified. Sources of support for NAMA implementation are primarily in the form of grants, equity and guarantees;

(b) The support for NAMA preparation and implementation is requested not only with the aim of achieving additional greenhouse gas emissions reductions but also in order to cover the base costs of initial projects;

(c) The registry contains limited detail on support requested, such as on the type of finance requested and its proposed use. However, it is generally understood that 'base costs' will be covered by foreign direct investments, private sector loans and equity, and grants or guarantees used for additional costs required for adopting low-carbon options or covering the risks of adopting low-cost carbon options;

(d) Detailed information can increase third party understanding and contribute to raising the likelihood of receiving support. Clarification should be provided regarding the use of financial or other resources, private-sector involvement, country ownership and benefits in terms of sustainable development.

10. A representative of UNDP (Azerbaijan country office) described the experiences of Azerbaijan in obtaining support for the preparation of the "NAMA for low-carbon end-use sectors in Azerbaijan". Azerbaijan received a grant for USD 3.57 million from the Global Environment Facility; UNDP serves as the implementing agency and has provided additional funding in the amount of USD 200,000. The presentation also covered lessons learned during the preparation and implementation of the NAMA.

11. Key points made during the presentation from UNDP included:

(a) Robust MRV systems help to attract donor support for NAMA preparation and implementation. Furthermore, MRV systems should be established in order to improve the setting of baselines and facilitate the development of greenhouse gas inventories;

(b) Structured institutional frameworks at the sectoral and sub-sectoral levels enhance country capacity to prepare and implement NAMAs;

(c) Challenges faced by the country include:

(i) The establishing of feedback mechanisms to ensure that the implementation of NAMAs reflects country priorities;

(ii) Assessing and addressing risk;

(iii) Ensuring that the best available technical expertise is employed for the preparation and implementation of the actions;

(iv) Guaranteeing that the project's results are sustainable and replicable.

12. The representative of the NAMA Facility shared the experience of the Facility in providing support for NAMAs. He announced that the NAMA Facility is now involved with the second call for NAMA support project outlines and that applications will be accepted until 15 July 2014. The total amount of funding available is EUR 50 million. Key messages from the presentation included:

(a) The first round of project funding has served as a source of lessons learned for the financing of mitigation action and has demonstrated the potential of the NAMA Facility in mobilizing scaled-up climate finance and furthering the discussion on climate finance;

(b) NAMAs selected for the first round fulfilled all eligibility criteria and performed well on ambition and feasibility. Other important aspects include the potential for transformational change, country ownership, relevance to the national context, potential for replication and sustainable development co-benefits;[3] The availability of funds earmarked for NAMA implementation has provided a strong stimulus to national governments to further develop their NAMAs;

[3] <http://nama-facility.org/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/NAMA_Facility_General_Information_Document_April2014.pdf>.

(c) There is a large project pipeline across all geographical regions calling for additional funding for NAMA implementation;

(d) NAMAs are successful in targeting sectors such as transport and agriculture which are not suitable for projects under the clean development mechanism (CDM) or joint implementation;

(e) Early involvement of actors is necessary, in particular those linked to finance to ensure adequate finance structuring and in-depth preparation of financial support mechanisms.

13. The representative of Colombia shared the country's experience with obtaining support for preparing and implementing NAMAs. She emphasized that Colombia's capacity for the preparation of NAMAs derives from the development of its Low Emission Development Strategy and referred to the example of the transit-oriented development NAMA, which has received support from the NAMA Facility. Other factors linked to mobilizing and attracting finance included robust capacity to track emission reductions and co-benefits; good communication between national government and local authorities; engaging strategic partners; and solid institutional frameworks.

14. The representative of Mexico also shared the experience of his country with obtaining support for preparing and implementing NAMAs. He presented the Mexican sustainable housing NAMA as a pilot for NAMA implementation, as it is the first such action to receive support from the NAMA Facility. He mentioned that several NAMAs are under development in Mexico, both domestically and internationally supported. He stressed the importance of finding a national 'champion' with the ability to mobilize the people and resources needed to take NAMAs from concept to reality. Institutional support and stakeholder involvement also play a major role in addressing barriers to NAMA preparation and implementation. He stressed that NAMAs involve large amounts of financial resources, which are unlikely to be provided in the form of grants. Under these circumstances, NAMA proponents should consider other instruments.

15. After the initial interventions by the panellists, the floor was opened for questions or views. Key messages included:

(a) Some participants emphasized the importance of the involvement of the private sector and the difficulty of securing it. The level of private-sector involvement varies depending on the NAMA sector and type of actions. In this context, the representative of Mexico described the example of NAMAs in the housing sector, which, owing to the nature of the sector, show a high level of involvement of private-sector investors;

(b) Other participants noted the difficulties in developing adequate baselines for their NAMAs. While the situation may be easier for NAMAs that are similar in nature to CDM projects, this is not necessarily the case with policy- or strategy-based NAMAs. In this context, some participants mentioned opportunities for collaboration with experts, including academia and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, for developing and disseminating baseline methodologies. Grant resources may be available to support this particular challenge.

16. A representative of Antigua and Barbuda noted that there is a lack of financial support available for small island developing States (SIDS). In this regard, specific capacity-building programmes that focus on SIDS are useful in leveraging the capacity of the countries and facilitating their access to international financial support.

C. Segment three: the extent of matching of nationally appropriate mitigation actions with support for nationally appropriate mitigation actions

17. The third segment opened with a presentation from a representative of the secretariat, which provided an overview of the extent of matching of NAMAs with support in the NAMA registry and, more generally, of the extent of use of the registry to date. He presented recent improvements to the registry aimed at raising the visibility of NAMAs that have received financial, technology or capacity-building support. Key points from the presentation included:

(a) Parties' participation in the registry is low, with about 46 NAMAs and nine sources of support being recorded. The distribution of access rights among users is also low, ranging from 30 to 60 per cent of countries depending on the region;

(b) There are currently two matches of NAMAs with support recorded in the registry:

(i) The NAMA identified as NS-85 ("Adaptive sustainable forest management in Borjomi-Bakuriani Forest District"), recorded by Georgia, received support from the source identified as S-99 ("Support for activities related to sustainable management of forests") recorded by Austria;

(ii) The NAMA identified as NS-95 ("Nationally appropriate mitigation actions for low-carbon end-use sectors in Azerbaijan"), recorded by Azerbaijan, received support from the support source identified as S-63 ("Global Environment Facility Trust Fund"), recorded by the Global Environment Facility;

(c) The entries submitted to the registry need to be reliable, complete and detailed in order to maximize their potential to receive support. The usefulness of the registry also depends on the number of entries recorded; the registry needs a critical mass of information in order to optimize its functionality;

(d) Immediate challenges in making the registry a success include more active participation and country ownership; improved, more reliable and updated information on the entries that have been recorded; and more interaction with the secretariat to improve the platform.

18. The representative mentioned that the secretariat will continue to support users of the registry through capacity-building activities, development of technical material, outreach activities and direct support to individual registry users, and by improving the registry platform.

19. The co-chairs invited participants to consider the following questions for discussion:

(a) What would be required for the registry to play a more active role in facilitating the matching of NAMAs with support?

(b) What are the main barriers to a more active engagement in the registry by the actors developing NAMAs and providing support for them? What actions could be taken by the secretariat?

(c) What other uses could the registry play beyond the facilitation of matching?

20. Some participants underlined the importance of the NAMA registry in sharing information on best practices, in particular as regards successful matches, while others stressed that the registry has helped them to enhance the visibility of their actions and to obtain support.

21. A representative of Uruguay mentioned that the country uses the registry to enhance the visibility of its NAMAs. Uruguay has six entries in the registry, some of which have been successful in obtaining support from Spain.

22. A representative of Colombia suggested that the functionality of the registry can be enhanced by extending its scope to include information on capacity-building initiatives.

United Nations

Framework Convention on Climate Change

FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.12

Distr.: General
9 September 2014

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Forty-first session
Lima, 1–8 December 2014

Item X of the provisional agenda

Report on the regional hands-on training workshops on the use of the non-Annex I greenhouse gas inventory software

Note by the secretariat

Summary

Between October 2013 and March 2014 the secretariat organized three regional hands-on training workshops on the use of the non-Annex I greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory software (NAIIS). The workshops were designed to train the national focal points and other relevant key national experts from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention involved in the preparation of their national GHG inventories in the use of NAIIS for preparing and reporting those national GHG inventories. This report outlines the proceedings of the workshops and summarizes the presentations made and discussions held. It also includes a summary of the recommendations made by the participants on possible improvements to NAIIS and the organization of such training workshops in the future.

GE.14-15890 (E)

1415890

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–7	3
	A. Mandate	1–4	3
	B. Scope of the note	5–6	3
	C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	7	4
II.	Proceedings of the workshops	8–15	4
	A. Introduction to and objective of the workshops	8–11	4
	B. Design and content of the workshops	12–15	5
III.	Participants' feedback	16–20	5
Annexes			
I.	List of participants in the hands-on training workshop for the Asia-Pacific region		8
II.	List of participants in the hands-on training workshop for the African and Eastern European regions		10
III.	List of participants in the hands-on training workshop for the Latin America and Caribbean region		12
IV.	Agenda for the hands-on training workshop for the Latin America and Caribbean region		14

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), at its thirty-fifth session, requested the secretariat to upgrade the national greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory software for Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties) and to make it available to such Parties by June 2013.[1]

2. In response to that request, the secretariat upgraded the existing Excel-based version of the software for use by non-Annex I Parties for compiling and developing their national GHG inventories to a web-based application, namely the non-Annex I GHG inventory software (NAIIS),[2] with enhanced functionalities. The upgraded web-based application was released on 6 June 2013. While both the Excel-based and upgraded web-based application are based on the same methodologies from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (hereinafter referred to as the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines), the IPCC *Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (hereinafter referred to as the IPCC good practice guidance) and the IPCC *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry* (hereinafter referred to as the IPCC good practice guidance for LULUCF), their design, layout and functionalities differ significantly.

3. SBI 39 and SBI 40 welcomed the efforts made by the secretariat to provide relevant training to national experts from non-Annex I Parties with a view to facilitating the efficient use of NAIIS. In addition, SBI 39 encouraged the secretariat to continue to make every effort to ensure that relevant training is made available to all non-Annex I Parties.[3]

4. Furthermore, SBI 40 thanked the Governments of the Philippines, Gabon and Colombia for having hosted the regional hands-on training workshops on the use of NAIIS, which were organized by the secretariat. In addition, it requested the secretariat to report, at SBI 41, on the regional hands-on training workshops on the use of NAIIS organized by the secretariat in the period 2013–2014.[4]

B. Scope of the note

5. This report on the proceedings of the three regional hands-on training workshops on the use of NAIIS includes a brief summary of the presentations made by resource persons and secretariat staff and the subsequent discussions held, as well as recommendations on possible improvements to NAIIS and the implementation of possible future regional training workshops.

6. The report covers the following:

(a) The hands-on training workshop for the Asia-Pacific region on the use of NAIIS, held in Manila, Philippines, from 14 to 18 October 2013;

---

[1] FCCC/SBI/2011/17, paragraph 43.

[2] The web-based application NAIIS is available at <http://unfccc.int/7627.php>.

[3] FCCC/SBI/2013/20, paragraph 38, and FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 33.

[4] FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 33.

(b) The hands-on training workshop for the African and Eastern European regions on the use of NAIIS, held in Libreville, Gabon, from 10 to 14 March 2014;

(c) The hands-on training workshop for the Latin America and Caribbean region on the use of NAIIS, held in Bogota, Colombia, from 24 to 28 March 2014.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

7. The SBI, having considered this report, may wish to note the recommendations made by the workshop participants and provide further guidance to the secretariat, as appropriate, on the provision of further technical assistance to non-Annex I Parties to enable them to fulfil their reporting obligations under the Convention.

II. Proceedings of the workshops

A. Introduction to and objective of the workshops

8. In the period between October 2013 and March 2014 the secretariat organized three regional hands-on training workshops on the use of NAIIS:

(a) The hands-on training workshop for the Asia-Pacific region on the use of NAIIS was hosted by the Government of the Philippines in Manila from 14 to 18 October 2013. The workshop was attended by 40 national experts representing 29 non-Annex I Parties from the region;[4]

(b) The hands-on training workshop for the African and Eastern European regions was hosted by the Government of Gabon in Libreville, Gabon, from 10 to 14 March 2014. The workshop was attended by 42 national experts representing 37 non-Annex I Parties from the regions;[5]

(c) The hands-on training workshop for the Latin America and Caribbean region was hosted by the Government of Colombia in Bogota, Colombia, from 24 to 28 March 2014. The workshop was attended by 29 national experts representing 23 non-Annex I Parties from the region.[7]

9. The main objective of the three regional hands-on training workshops was to train the national focal points and other relevant key national experts involved in the preparation of their national GHG inventories in the use of NAIIS for preparing and reporting those national GHG inventories.

10. As encouraged by SBI 33 and SBI 34, in order to maximize participation in the workshops,[8] the secretariat arranged a facility for national experts to participate remotely in the workshops via videoconferencing. Such remote participation allowed for a total of 55, 48 and 167 additional experts from the Asia-Pacific, African and Eastern European, and Latin American and Caribbean regions, respectively, to be involved in the training workshops over each five-day period.

11. The workshops were organized with the financial support of Australia, Canada and the European Union.

[4] For a list of participants, see annex I.
[5] For a list of participants, see annex II.
[7] For a list of participants, see annex III.
[8] FCCC/SBI/2010/27, paragraph 29, and FCCC/SBI/2011/7, paragraph 34.

B. Design and content of the workshops

12. The three regional hands-on training workshops were similar in design and structure, including theory as well as hands-on exercises using realistic sets of data. The morning sessions were devoted to refresher courses on the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines, as well as on the IPCC good practice guidance and the IPCC good practice guidance for LULUCF, including cross-cutting issues, on the basis of training materials developed by the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention.[9] The afternoon sessions were dedicated to hands-on practice of using NAIIS, in line with the corresponding themes covered in the morning sessions.

13. The hands-on training sessions, through presentations, a live demonstration and hands-on exercises using a set of country data, introduced the different functionalities of NAIIS to the workshop participants. Both the theory and hands-on exercises covered the following themes: inventory management (user management, and management of different versions of the inventory as well as the workflow to produce the final version of the national GHG inventory), key cross-cutting issues (key category analysis, completeness and consistency checks) and all of the sectors (energy, industrial processes, agriculture, land-use change and forestry/land use, land-use change and forestry, and waste). The participants were given ample time to practise and better understand the different functionalities that are available and how they work, as well as to interact with the resource persons and gain confidence in using the application.

14. All three regional hands-on training workshops were structured as follows:[10]

(a) The first day was dedicated to general and cross-cutting themes related to the development of sustainable national GHG inventory management systems, as well as to methodological and data choices, addressing data gaps, the IPCC emission factor database, quality assurance/quality control procedures, key category analysis and uncertainty assessment;

(b) The second up to the first half of the fifth day were dedicated to the five sectors of the national GHG inventory. The training for each sector covered: an overview, emission sources and sinks, basic emission processes and good practice guidance, as well as a walk-through session on the relevant module of NAIIS and a hands-on exercise using a case study on the use of NAIIS;

(c) The last half-day was dedicated to an additional session on the implementation of important cross-cutting issues as well as to feedback from the participants.

15. The training sessions were conducted by resource persons, including consultants and secretariat staff members.

III. Participants' feedback

16. When closing each of the three workshops, an evaluation was conducted in the form of a questionnaire. Comments and recommendations were solicited from the participants on possible improvements to the training materials and on how the conduct of such workshops could be improved in the future. The participants expressed their appreciation to the secretariat for organizing the regional training workshops and to the Governments of the

[9] Available at <http://unfccc.int/349.php>.

[10] The agenda for one of the workshops is included in annex IV.

Philippines, Gabon and Colombia for hosting them and providing excellent facilities. They also thanked the Parties that funded the workshops.

17. The participants were very positive[11] about the workshops and stated that they looked forward to using NAIIS.[12] The vast majority found NAIIS to be better than the Excel software.[13] Throughout the five-day period, they engaged in completing the hands-on training exercises with a great deal of enthusiasm. They explored all of the functionalities of NAIIS and many of them expressed interest in repeating the exercises back home using the data provided during the workshops. In general, the workshops were successful in achieving the following:

(a) Familiarizing the national experts from non-Annex I Parties with NAIIS;

(b) Fostering a general understanding of the methodologies used for estimating national GHG emissions by sources and removals by sinks;

(c) Serving as a platform for sharing experiences and lessons learned among national experts from the same region;

(d) Promoting networking among national experts involved in compiling their national GHG inventories;

(e) Enhancing awareness of the availability, functionality and utility of NAIIS and prompting additional requests for access to it (as at 26 August 2014, 42 non-Annex I Parties had started using NAIIS).

18. The workshop participants highlighted the relevance and utility of NAIIS:

(a) The documentation and archiving functionalities can facilitate the maintaining of an institutional memory of the work on the national GHG inventory within countries;

(b) The user management functionality will make the management of the national GHG inventory team more efficient;

(c) The ability of NAIIS to, among other things, save data in real time, export and import into Excel and XML formats, deal with multi-year data in one go, implement some aspects of quality assurance/quality control, conduct key category analysis, etc. was seen as a positive aspect;

(d) NAIIS can be run using any standard web browser, independent of any special software.

19. The following recommendations were made regarding NAIIS, some of which had already been implemented as at 25 April 2014, when the latest version of NAIIS, including some technical enhancements and bug fixes, was released for use by non-Annex I Parties:

(a) There is a need to restrict the ability to export and import data entry grids to the user's assigned sector;

(b) The exported data entry grids and tables should include a time stamp, indicating time, version and the status of the inventory or parts of the inventory being exported;

---

[11] The overall satisfaction rating given to the workshops ranged between 87 and 100 per cent.

[12] The overall satisfaction rating given to the web-based application NAIIS ranged between 62 and 89 per cent.

[13] The overall satisfaction rating given to the first-use experience of NAIIS ranged between 69 and 86 per cent.

(c) There is a need to include a functionality to trace any changes made by the different members of the team using NAIS;

(d) There is a need to add the ability to produce graphs.

20. Overall, the level of satisfaction of the participants in the three workshops was high, regarding both NAIS and the organization of the workshops.

Annex I

List of participants in the hands-on training workshop for the Asia-Pacific region

Title	*First name*	*Surname*	*Country organization function*
Mr.	Naqibulla	Sediqi	Afghanistan
Mr.	Md. Shamsul	Alam	Bangladesh
Mr.	Tsheten	Dorji	Bhutan
Ms.	Bumpa	Lhamo	Bhutan
Mr.	Rinzin	Namgay	Bhutan
Ms.	Lizah Biti	Juma'At	Brunei Darussalam
Ms.	Dk Haryanti	Pg Haji Petra	Brunei Darussalam
Mr.	Mohammad Akmal Fikry	Yusra	Brunei Darussalam
Mr.	Sophal	Leang	Cambodia
Ms.	Vaine Terepai Celine	Dyer	Cook Islands
Mr.	Abdelkarim	Shalabi	Jordan
Ms.	Regina	Rotitaake	Kiribati
Mr.	Immala	Inthaboualy	Lao People's Democratic Republic
Mr.	Ramzi	Shasha	Lebanon
Ms.	Amy Charlene	Wong	Malaysia
Mr.	Stephen	Why	Marshall Islands
Mr.	Gereit-Od	Tsogtbaatar	Mongolia
Mr.	Sujan	Subedi	Nepal
Mr.	Imran	Khan	Pakistan
Ms.	Sherlyn	Weplu	Papua New Guinea
Mr.	Rolando	Abad, Jr.	Philippines
Mr.	Arnold Grant	Belver	Philippines
Ms.	Gerarda Asuncion	Merilo	Philippines
Ms.	Aura Venia	Rayala	Philippines
Ms.	Sandee	Recabar	Philippines
Mr.	Abdulmalek	Alobra	Saudi Arabia
Mr.	Khalid	Alwafi	Saudi Arabia

Title	*First name*	*Surname*	*Country organization function*
Ms.	Tian	Goh	Singapore
Ms.	Shu Yee	Wong	Singapore
Ms.	Surani	Pathirana	Sri Lanka
Mr.	Nasimjon	Rajabov	Tajikistan
Mr.	Sivach	Kaewcharoen	Thailand
Mr.	Antolicio Francisco	Guterres	Timor-Leste
Mr.	Raimundo	Mau	Timor-Leste
Mr.	Florenciano	Miranda Da Costa	Timor-Leste
Mr.	Laiseni	Liava'A	Tonga
Ms.	Viktoriya	Akopova	Turkmenistan
Ms.	Yulia	Kovalevskaya	Uzbekistan
Mr.	Christopher	Simelum	Vanuatu
Ms.	Anh	Nguyen Van	Viet Nam
Mr.	Hussein	Shedaiwa	Yemen
Mr.	Sabin	Guendehou	Resource person
Mr.	Philip	Acquah	Resource person
Mr.	Jigme		UNFCCC/resource person
Mr.	Dominique	Revet	UNFCCC/resource person
Ms.	Lornaliza	Kogler	UNFCCC/resource person

Annex II

List of participants in the hands-on training workshop for the African and Eastern European regions

Title	*First name*	*Surname*	*Country organization function*
Ms.	Salima	Cherchali	Algeria
Mr.	Baritz	Mehdiyev	Azerbaijan
Mr.	Jacques Bamikole	Kouazounde	Benin
Ms.	Chandapiwa Peggy	Sebeela	Botswana
Mr.	Diomède	Nyengayenge	Burundi
Mr.	Francisco	da Veiga Correia	Cabo Verde
Mr.	Jerry Maxime	Manza Loti	Central African Republic
Mr.	Mahamat Hassane	Idriss	Chad
Ms.	Said Abdallah	Batouli	Comoros
Mr.	Gaston	Samba	Congo
Mr.	Kouadio Désiré	N'Goran	Côte d'Ivoire
Mr.	Mohammad Hamdy	Darraj	Egypt
Mr.	Michael Yemanr	Mehreteab	Eritrea
Mr.	Berhanu Solomon	Genet	Ethiopia
Ms.	Guigwenina	Magoulou	Gabon
Mr.	Georges Bayonne	Mboumba	Gabon
Mr.	Bruno	Nkoumakali	Gabon
Mr.	Eric Arnaud	Otogo Castane	Gabon
Mr.	Bernard Landry	Panzou	Gabon
Mr	Lamin Mai	Touray	Gambia
Mr.	Giorgi	Mukhigulishvili	Georgia
Mr.	Joy	Ankomah	Ghana
Mr.	Karifa	Kourouma	Guinea
Mr.	Heloyso Eduardo	Cunha Kassimo	Guinea-Bissau
Mr.	David Buluku	Adegu	Kenya
Mr.	Victor Pheello	Ralenkoane	Lesotho
Mr.	Boima	Kiazolu	Liberia
Mr.	Todisoa	Manankasina	Madagascar

Title	*First name*	*Surname*	*Country, organization, function*
Ms.	Hannah	Kasongo	Malawi
Mr.	Drissa	Doumbia	Mali
Mrs.	Devika	Balgobin	Mauritius
Mr.	Clemencio	Nhantumbo	Mozambique
Mr.	Abdoulaye	Issa	Niger
Mr.	Herman	Hakuzimana	Rwanda
Mr.	Artur	Trindade	Sao Tome and Principe
Mr.	Papa Lamine	Diouf	Senegal
Mr.	Sahr	Aruna	Sierra Leone
Ms.	Lungile	Manzini	South Africa
Mr.	Gossi Awad	Ahmed Babiker	Sudan
Ms.	Khetsiwe	Khumalo	Swaziland
Mr.	Abiziou	Tchinguilou	Togo
Ms.	Ons Khechine	Bouzghaya	Tunisia
Mr.	Akram	Hamza	Tunisia
Ms.	Mwiche	Kabwe	Zambia
Mr.	Philip	Acquah	Resource person
Mr.	Sabin	Guendehou	Resource person
Mr.	Jigme		UNFCCC/resource person
Mr.	Dominique	Revet	UNFCCC/resource person
Ms.	Lornaliza	Kogler	UNFCCC/resource person

Annex III

List of participants in the hands-on training workshop for the Latin America and Caribbean region

Title	*First name*	*Surname*	*Country organization function*
Ms.	Helena	Brown	Antigua and Barbuda
Ms.	Maria Sol	Aliano	Argentina
Mr.	Robert	Hall	Bahamas
Mr.	William	Hinds	Barbados
Mr.	Edgar	Ek	Belize
Ms.	Danielly	Godiva Santana Molleta	Brazil
Mr.	Paulo	Cornejo	Chile
Mr.	Juan Gabriel	Osorio Osuna	Colombia
Ms.	Vicky	Guerrero Barrios	Colombia
Ms.	Katherine	Ovalle-Sanabria	Colombia
Ms.	Gladys	Jiménez	Costa Rica
Ms.	Kimisha	Thomas	Dominica
Ms.	Karen	Hedeman Lluberes	Dominican Republic
Ms.	Alexandra	Buri	Ecuador
Mr.	Alejandro	Espin	Ecuador
Ms.	Pamela	Sangoluisa	Ecuador
Mr.	Marcel	Oseida de Leon	Guatemala
Mr.	Ewart	Moore	Guyana
Mr.	Stanley	Belizaire	Haiti
Mr.	Gerald Charles Atkinson	Lindo	Jamaica
Ms.	Carmen	Prieto	Panama
Mr.	Sylvester Franklin	Belle	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Ms.	Neranda	Maurice	Saint Lucia
Mr.	Cornelis	Becker	Suriname
Ms.	Delezia	Singh	Trinidad and Tobago
Ms.	Guadalupe Alejandra	Martinez Nuñez	Uruguay
Ms.	Carmen	Meneses	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Title	*First name*	*Surname*	*Country/organization/function*
Ms.	Karen	Ortega Marin	UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre
Mr.	Alexandre	Gellert Paris	UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre
Mr.	Philip	Acquah	Resource person
Mr.	Sabin	Guendehou	Resource person
Mr.	Donald	Cooper	UNFCCC/resource person
Mr.	Dominique	Revet	UNFCCC/resource person
Ms.	Lornaliza	Kogler	UNFCCC/resource person

Annex IV

Agenda for the hands-on training workshop for the Latin America and Caribbean region

Monday, 24 March 2014

8 a.m. to 9 a.m.	Registration

Session 1: Opening and introductory session

9 a.m. to 9.45 a.m.	Opening session

- Opening event and address – Dr. Rodrigo Suárez, Climate Change Director, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Colombia
- Welcome remarks – Mr. Donald Cooper, Coordinator, Mitigation, Data and Analysis Programme, UNFCCC
- Keynote address – Dr. Omar Franco, General Director, Instituto de Hidrología, Meteorología y Estudios Ambientales, Colombia

9.45 a.m. to 10 a.m.	Coffee break
10 a.m. to 10.20 a.m.	Introductory session

- Self-introduction – participants and resource persons
- Overview of the workshop

Session 2: National greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories: general and cross-cutting themes

10.20 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.	National GHG inventories: general and cross-cutting themes – theory

- Introduction
- Building a sustainable national GHG inventory management system
- Cross-cutting issues, such as methodological and data choices, addressing data gaps, the emission factor database, quality assurance/quality control procedures, key category analysis and uncertainty assessment

12.30 p.m. to 2 p.m.	Lunch break
2 p.m. to 4.30 p.m.	National GHG inventories: general and cross-cutting themes – practical

- Introduction to the non-Annex I GHG inventory software (NAIS)
- NAIS users, and inventory and submission management

4.30 p.m. to 4.45 p.m.	Coffee break
4.45 p.m. to 6 p.m.	• Key category analysis, consistency check and uncertainty assessment • Software application exercise on user and inventory management

Tuesday, 25 March 2014

Session 3: Energy sector

9 a.m. to 10.30 a.m.	Fuel combustion – theory • Sector overview • Emission sources and activities • Basic emission processes • Good practice guidance
10.30 a.m. to 10.45 a.m.	Coffee break
10.45 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.	Application of NAIIS for the energy sector – fuel combustion • Walk-through session on the NAIIS energy module, including detailed discussion on methodologies and how they are implemented in the software • Case study, using real country-specific data, on the use of the software
11.30 a.m. to 2 p.m.	Payment of daily subsistence allowance and lunch break
2 p.m. to 3.30 p.m.	Fugitive emissions – theory • Sector overview • Emission sources and activities • Basic emission processes • Good practice guidance
3.30 p.m. to 3.45 p.m.	Coffee break
3.45 p.m. to 6 p.m.	Application of NAIIS for the energy sector – fugitive emissions • Walk-through session on NAIIS energy module, including detailed discussion on methodologies and how they are implemented in the software • Case study, using real country-specific data, on the use of the software

Wednesday, 26 March 2014

Session 4: Industrial processes and waste sectors

9 a.m. to 10.45 a.m.	Industrial processes – theory • Sector overview • Emission sources and activities • Basic emission processes • Good practice guidance
10.45 a.m. to 11 a.m.	Coffee break
11 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.	Application of NAIIS for the industrial processes sector • Walk-through session on NAIIS industrial processes module, including detailed discussion on methodologies and how they are implemented in the software • Case study, using real country-specific data, on the use of the software
12.30 p.m. to 2 p.m.	Lunch break
2 p.m. to 3.30 p.m.	Waste sector – theory • Sector overview • Emission sources and activities • Basic emission processes • Good practice guidance
3.30 p.m. to 3.45 p.m.	Coffee break
3.45 p.m. to 6 p.m.	Application of NAIIS for the waste sector • Walk-through session on NAIIS waste module, including detailed discussion on methodologies and how they are implemented in the software • Case study, using real country-specific data, on the use of the software

Thursday, 27 March 2014

Session 5: Agriculture sector

9 a.m. to 10.45 a.m.	Agriculture – theory • Sector overview • Emission sources and activities • Basic emission processes • Good practice guidance
10.45 a.m. to 11 a.m.	Coffee break
11 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.	Application of NAIS for the agriculture sector • Walk-through session on NAIS agriculture module, including detailed discussion on methodologies and how they are implemented in the software • Case study, using real country-specific data, on the use of the software
12.30 p.m. to 2 p.m.	Lunch break
2 p.m. to 3 p.m.	Application of NAIS for the agriculture sector (cont.)

Session 6: Land-use change and forestry (LUCF)/land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) sector

3 p.m. to 4.45 p.m.	LUCF/LULUCF – theory • Sector overview • Emission source/sink categories and sinks • Basic emission processes • Good practice guidance for LULUCF
4.45 p.m. to 5 p.m.	Coffee break
5 p.m. to 6 p.m.	LUCF/LULUCF – theory (cont.)

Friday, 28 March 2014	
9 a.m. to 10.45 a.m.	Application of NAIIS for the LUCF/LULUCF sector • Walk-through session on LUCF/LULUCF module, including detailed discussion on methodologies and how they are implemented in the software • Case study, using real country-specific data, on the use of the software
10.45 a.m. to 11 a.m.	Coffee break
11 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.	Application of NAIIS for the LUCF/LULUCF sector (cont.)
12.30 p.m. to 2 p.m.	Lunch break
2 p.m. to 3 p.m.	Cross-cutting issues – additional session
3 p.m. to 4 p.m.	Feedback and wrap-up session (questions and answers) and closing

United Nations

FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.13

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
14 October 2014

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Forty-first session
Lima, 1–8 December 2014

Item 19(a) of the provisional agenda
Reports on other activities
Report on the expert meeting on an information hub for information on the results of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, and results-based payments

Report on the expert meeting on an information hub for information on the results of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, and results-based payments

Note by the secretariat

Summary

An expert meeting on an information hub for information on results of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, and results-based payments was held in Bonn, Germany, on 2 and 3 September 2014. Party representatives gave presentations, describing their experience with the set-up of national information portals related to the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, and making proposals regarding the information hub. The presentations that followed, made by experts from intergovernmental organizations and the REDD+ Partnership, focused on sharing experiences with data reporting and portal management at the international level and presenting potential options for the design of the information hub. In plenary discussions, experts engaged in a detailed technical consideration related to the design and functionalities of the information hub, ways to enter information in the information hub and options related to entries of corresponding results-based payments. Experts concluded that the information hub should be flexible enough to evolve in case Parties want to revisit some options or functions after gaining more experience with the implementation of results-based actions related to the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation may wish to take note of the outcome of these discussions at its forty-first session.

GE.14-18549 (E)

1418549

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–5	3
	A. Background and mandate	1–4	3
	B. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	5	4
II.	Proceedings	6–10	4
III.	Summary of presentations	11-19	5
IV.	Summary of the plenary discussions	20–34	7
	A. Design and functionalities of the information hub	21–24	7
	B. Entering information in the information hub	25–28	8
	C. Technical considerations related to entries of results-based payments	29–30	8
	D. Consideration of options related to additional information	31–33	9
	E. Future improvement of the information hub	34	9

I. Introduction

A. Background and mandate

1. By decision 9/CP.19, on the work programme on results-based finance to progress the full implementation of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70 (hereinafter referred to as "REDD-plus activities"),[1] the Conference of the Parties (COP) established an information hub on the web platform on the UNFCCC website[2] (hereinafter referred to as the REDD web platform) as a means of publishing information on the results of REDD-plus activities and corresponding results-based payments. The COP noted that the information hub aims to increase transparency of information on results-based actions, on the corresponding payments, as well as information related to the elements referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 71, without creating additional requirements for developing country Parties.[3]

2. The COP also decided that the information hub will contain:[4]

(a) The results for each relevant period expressed in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year and a link to the technical report referred to in decision 14/CP.19, paragraph 14;

(b) The assessed forest reference emission level(s) and/or forest reference level(s) expressed in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year and a link to the final report of the technical assessment team referred to in decision 13/CP.19, paragraph 18;

(c) The summary of information on how all of the safeguards referred to in decision 1/CP.16, appendix I, are being addressed and respected, as referred to in decisions 12/CP.19 and 12/CP.17, chapter I;

(d) A link to the national strategy or action plan as referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 71(a), as appropriate;

(e) Information on the national forest monitoring system, as provided in the technical annex referred to in decision 14/CP.19;

(f) Information on each of the results, including the quantity of results for which payments were received, expressed in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year, and the entity paying for results.

3. The COP agreed that the information on results-based payments is to be inserted on the information hub in consultation with the developing country Party concerned, taking into full account decision 10/CP.19, paragraph 2.[5]

4. Furthermore, the COP requested the secretariat to organize an expert meeting on the matters referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 above, as well as on the format for the insertion of the information referred to in paragraph 2(f) above, and to prepare a report on that expert

[1] In decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, the Conference of the Parties encouraged developing country Parties to contribute to mitigation actions in the forest sector by undertaking the following activities: reducing emissions from deforestation; reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks; sustainable management of forests; and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

[2] <http://unfccc.int/redd>.

[3] Decision 9/CP.19, paragraphs 9 and 10.

[4] Decision 9/CP.19, paragraphs 11 and 12.

[5] Decision 9/CP.19, paragraph 13.

meeting for consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) at its forty-first session.[6]

B. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

5. SBI 41 may wish to take note of this document as part of its consideration of its agenda sub-item 19(a). This would enable the secretariat to establish the information hub at the soonest possible time.

II. Proceedings

6. The expert meeting on an information hub for information on results of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, and results-based payments took place at the United Nations Campus in Bonn, Germany, on 2 and 3 September 2014. It was chaired by the Chair of the SBI, Mr. Amena Yauvoli (Fiji). The chair introduced the mandate and objectives of the expert meeting and presented the approach to the work. Financial support for the workshop was provided by the Government of Norway.

7. In total, 46 experts participated in the expert meeting, representing 30 Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention, 7 Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, and including three experts from intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), two experts from nongovernmental organizations and two experts representing the REDD+ Partnership. The IGOs represented were the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries and the World Bank.

8. The expert meeting was organized in three sessions. The objective of the meeting was to allow experts:

(a) To identify and discuss in-depth the technical considerations for the set-up of an information hub and to propose ways to address and/or take on these technical considerations to ensure the efficient and effective operation of the hub;

(b) To propose format options for the insertion of the information provided by Parties and relevant entities;

(c) To recommend ways to improve and further develop the web platform to ensure that the information made available on the hub is transparent and easily accessible.

9. For each of the three sessions, the chair of the meeting provided some background information and posed guiding questions. The questions posed were:

(a) For session I (setting the scene): what are some lessons learned from the implementation of national REDD-plus portals that could inform the design of the information hub?

(b) For session II (the big picture – general look and feel):

(i) What can be learned from the international reporting of forest-related data and the design of related information portals with regard to making the information available in a simple, transparent and easily accessible manner?

(ii) What should be the entry point for the information hub, and the relationship between the information hub and the REDD web platform?

[6] Decision 9/CP.19, paragraph 15.

(iii) How can the interaction between the secretariat and developing country Parties in the matter of insertion of information on results-based payments be structured efficiently?

(c) For session III (detailed technical considerations):

(i) In order to differentiate between the different sources of payments for one result, should there be a possibility to voluntarily specify information for each payment received, such as information on the time, geographic location, project number, web link, or other additional information?

(ii) How to best ensure that links with any other relevant future system developed under the Convention will be possible (decision 9/CP.19, para. 17)?

10. The agenda and a background note for the expert meeting, a webcast recording of the meeting and the presentations by representatives of Parties and the intergovernmental organizations are available on the UNFCCC website.[7]

III. Summary of presentations

11. Four Parties gave presentations, describing their experience with the set-up of national information portals for REDD-plus and making proposals regarding the information hub. The secretariat gave a presentation on the potential options for the design of the information hub. Three other presentations, made by experts from intergovernmental organizations and the REDD+ Partnership, followed, in which the experience of these organizations with data reporting and portal management at the international level was shared.

12. The first presentation was given by an expert from Indonesia on the country's experience with its Portfolio Management of REDD-plus system (PORTREDD). The programme registry and management system of PORTREDD comprises three distinct components: an open system for registering REDD-plus projects and programmes in Indonesia, recording of compliance with safeguards for reporting through the country's safeguards information system, and the program management system for the tracking, monitoring and reporting of programmes. PORTREDD is currently in the design phase. The expert emphasized the importance of simplicity and user-friendliness, in particular for increasing the participation of stakeholders. Guiding principles for the development of PORTREDD include, among others, transparency, accountability, consistency and comprehensiveness.

13. An expert from Paraguay presented the country's approaches to sharing information related to REDD-plus activities. The national system for information related to REDD-plus encompasses different platforms, notably the Environmental Information System (SIAM) and the National Forest Information System (SNIF). Paraguay's aim is to integrate these different platforms using one access point for all information related to REDD-plus activities. The national forest monitoring system module will link with the SNIF and the SIAM. Building such an integrated information system in a way that ensures transparency requires significant coordination among government agencies, as well as coordination between the government and the civil society.

14. An expert from Brazil called attention to six basic principles that should apply to the information hub and the related database: the database should be open-format, interoperable and simple, while the information layout should be user-friendly, accessible and transparent. The presentation provided two examples of the design of the information hub.

[7] <http://unfccc.int/8458>.

The expert also highlighted the importance of a search engine for searching by country and region, and of a sorting engine for classifying data according to the user's preferences. It was suggested that a link to further information could be displayed if deemed appropriate by the developing country Party. Finally, the expert presented an example of a simplified form for providing information to the information hub.

15. An expert from the United States of America presented on lessons learned from the State of California's experience with offset project registries and from the Partnership for Market Readiness, a global partnership of 31 developed and developing countries providing funding and technical assistance for the collective innovation and piloting of market-based instruments for greenhouse gas emissions reductions. The expert explained that documentation on programmes, results and any information submitted should be recorded transparently, publicly and accurately. She also provided detailed ideas on how to translate the provisions contained in decision 9/CP.19 into a proposal for the information hub. In essence, the information hub should be simple, easy to manage, should not place an additional burden on Parties, and should contain information that is accurate, transparent and useful.

16. A representative of the secretariat presented options for the design of the information hub in line with decision 9/CP.19, including options on the technical set-up, display of information and the consultation process with the developing country concerned. The representative noted that additional information, such as the name of the submitting country and the submission year or date, would probably be needed for each result in the information hub in order to differentiate between entries. He concluded that using similar technology and design for the information hub and the upgrade of the REDD web platform would lead to efficiency gains.

17. In her presentation, the representative of the World Bank focused on data management and reporting for the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. She explained that countries expect data management systems to support the implementation of their REDD-plus strategy and to ensure consistency of REDD-plus activities carried out at different scales. Data management systems are also expected to promote transparency and equity by providing access to information to different categories of stakeholders. The expert added that countries' needs, circumstances and capacity will determine the approach to data management and emission reduction registries used to comply with the requirements of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility.

18. The FAO expert provided input, based on the lessons learned from country reporting, to the "global forest resources assessments". The expert highlighted several challenges that these assessments faced, including a lack of continuity due to changes in national correspondents, limited training resources and generally a limited capacity of countries to respond to the high demand for additional information. According to the expert, some of these challenges could also be encountered in the use of the information hub. He also mentioned the challenges, faced by some countries, posed by software bugs and online connection difficulties. Issues related to data quality include unknown precision or time series inconsistencies, suggesting that data checking and cleaning is crucial. The expert finally highlighted the importance of targeted capacity-building investments and of the role of partnerships in reducing the reporting burden, and underlined that automation and review are critical and need substantial resources.

19. The last presentation was given by an expert from the REDD+ Partnership on experiences with the creation and maintenance of the voluntary REDD+ database (VRD). The VRD contains data voluntarily reported by member countries and institutions in a questionnaire sent annually to VRD focal points. Challenges related to data collection include identification and availability of VRD focal points, difficulties in data sourcing, non-harmonized understanding of the categories within the VRD and difficulties in using a

standard data collection format containing mandatory and non-mandatory fields for each entry. Moreover, although online reporting is efficient, difficulties in internet access suggest that a flexible process is required. Working to resolve discrepancies between recipients' and funders' reports was identified as an important activity for the VRD. The expert concluded that quality assurance processes and dedicated resources for administering the platform are essential.

IV. Summary of the plenary discussions

20. During sessions II and III of the expert meeting, the discussion was guided by options and questions posed by the chair of the meeting and presented to experts in a background note[8] (see para. 9 above). The experts engaged in plenary discussions, addressing and elaborating on technical and design questions in the consideration of the design of the information hub.

A. Design and functionalities of the information hub

21. The experts recalled the importance of the mandate for the information hub.[9] They also recalled that the information hub aims to increase the transparency of REDD-plus results-based actions, corresponding payments and information related to the elements referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 71. They emphasized that it is very important that the information hub be practical, user-friendly, simple and transparent in order to become a comprehensive source of information without creating additional requirements for developing country Parties.

22. Regarding the design of the information hub, experts shared the view that consolidating proposals from the presentations given by experts from Parties while maintaining the unique features of each proposal would form a good basis for a solid and useful information hub. The landing page should display a list of results with the option to access more detailed information, for example on separate pages dedicated to countries. Experts further emphasized that the information hub has to be designed in a way that avoids any double reporting.

23. The rich discussions among experts contributed a number of ideas on the design and functionality of the information hub. Among the ideas were making the data freely downloadable for use by different stakeholders and using an open-format database for the management of data, which would allow for the replication of data in other areas of the website. Many experts were also favourable to the adding of visualizations like graphics and figures to the information hub, if possible. Some experts suggested that the main page of the information hub should feature a search engine for countries and regions, as well as the option to sort the information.

24. All experts requested the secretariat to explore ways to make the REDD web platform more visible and easier to find on the UNFCCC website, and to establish several entry points for the information hub in different locations of the UNFCCC website. They emphasized that efficiency gains and improvements, especially improved user-friendliness, are always welcome. It was further suggested to consistently use the term "REDD-plus web platform" on the UNFCCC website.

[8] <http://unfccc.int/files/methods/redd/application/pdf/info_hub_background_note-rev.pdf>.

[9] Decision 9/CP.19, paragraphs 9 and 10.

B. Entering information in the information hub

25. It was pointed out that the information referred to in decision 9/CP.19, paragraph 11, will be included in the information hub by the secretariat once all of the information is available through the appropriate channels under the Convention. The basis for each entry row would be an assessed forest reference emission level or forest reference level and the corresponding results, analysed in accordance with decision 14/CP.19.

26. Information on the quantity of results for which payments were received and the entity paying for results would have to be provided separately. Logically, one result entry could correspond to several entries for payments from several entities. Some experts were of the view that it would be especially useful to display the amount of emission reductions still available for payments, so as to allow donors to easily identify emission reductions that are seeking results-based payments.

27. It is possible to anticipate that in the future the information on the elements referred to in decision 9/CP.19, paragraph 11(c–e), on the summary of information on how all of the safeguards referred to in decision 1/CP.16, appendix I, are being addressed and respected, on the national strategy or action plan, and on the information on the national forest monitoring system could be updated at some point. Therefore, the question was posed whether the corresponding information in the information hub should refer to the most recent information provided or that provided for the relevant period of the results. Experts concluded that for the time being it would be left to the developing country Party to indicate which documents should be displayed in the information hub.

28. Experts recalled that information on results-based payments provided by sources other than the developing country Party concerned should only be inserted upon consultation with the developing country Party, as agreed in decision 9/CP.19, paragraph 13, and that it would be useful to display the corresponding contact information of the developing country Party in the information hub, as appropriate. Technically the consultation could be achieved in an e-mail conversation or through a system in which each entry of a results-based payment has to be approved by the developing country Party concerned through a secured account before it becomes visible on the information hub.

C. Technical considerations related to entries of results-based payments

29. Experts discussed whether the results for each relevant period should be annualized when entering the results in the information hub, or whether the results should cover the full crediting period, with corresponding results-based payments attributed to the year in which they were received. Decision 9/CP.19, paragraph 11(a), refers to the results for each relevant period, and the experts were of the view that it should be left to each developing country Party to decide on the relevant period.

30. Another point of discussion was whether information on the status of emission reductions should be included in the information hub, with options being, for example, active, paid for, available for payment, or cancelled. It was cautioned that the meaning of many of the terms could change according to the context, and that therefore it would be better to avoid their use in the context of the information hub, with the exception of those used to denote whether the achieved emission reductions are seeking results-based payments.

D. Consideration of options related to additional information

31. Experts discussed the possibility of adding additional information to the information hub on a voluntary basis. There was a diversity of views on what kind of additional information could be useful. Examples include a link to the document containing the payment agreement or contract, the numerical coding of results, information on the entity receiving the payments, information on whether the approach is national or subnational, additional details on the geographic location, and more information on any additional certification of the activities. Experts discussed how to find a balance between simplicity and transparency, and agreed to leave the decision to the developing country Party providing the information. In order to keep the information hub simple and avoid an unmanageable increase of information fields, it was agreed that such information should be displayed on a separate page dedicated to the developing country providing the information.

32. Experts also discussed the question of whether the information hub should contain only results-based actions or should also contain information on activities in the earlier phases of REDD-plus. Experts noted that there is already a space for this information on readiness activities on the REDD web platform, which was initially set up for this purpose under a COP mandate,[10] and on which the information hub will also be located. It was also noted that the COP reaffirmed[11] that the progression of developing country Parties towards results-based actions occurs in the context of the provision of adequate and predictable support for all phases of REDD-plus activities and actions.

33. Some experts suggested that the information from the voluntary REDD-plus database of the interim REDD+ Partnership should not be lost in case the Partnership ceases to exist, and that ways could be explored to provide a link on the REDD web platform to the information in the voluntary REDD-plus database, or to make the information available as a simple spreadsheet for download via the REDD web platform.

E. Future improvement of the information hub

34. Finally, several experts emphasized that the information hub does not need to be perfect from the beginning, but that it should be flexible enough to evolve in case Parties want to revisit some options or functions after gaining more experience with the implementation of results-based REDD-plus actions. This would also apply to the possibility of linking results in the information hub to the same results reflected on any other relevant future system that may be developed under the Convention.[12]

---

[10] Decision 2/CP.13.

[11] Decision 9/CP.19.

[12] Decision 9/CP.19, paragraph 17.

United Nations

Framework Convention on Climate Change

FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.14

Distr.: General
29 November 2014

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Forty-first session
Lima, 1–8 December 2014

Item 9 of the provisional agenda
National adaptation plans

Information paper on experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

Summary

This information paper presents experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans (NAPs), based on the submissions from Parties and organizations on NAPs, and the first and second NAP Expo, held in Bonn, Germany, on 9 June 2013 and from 8 to 9 August 2014, respectively. The information paper also draws relevant experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs from meetings organized by the Adaptation Committee and the Least Developed Countries Expert Group in 2013 and 2014. The experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs are organized around the four elements and the modalities of the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–3	3
	A. Mandate	1	3
	B. Scope	2–3	3
II.	Overview of the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans	4–16	4
	A. Establishment of the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans	4–5	4
	B. Modalities for support	6–14	4
	C. Progress on the national adaptation plan process to date	15–16	6
III.	Experiences, lessons learned, good practices, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans	17–71	6
	A. Element A: laying the groundwork and addressing gaps	19–29	7
	B. Element B: preparatory elements	30–34	9
	C. Element C: implementation strategies	35–42	10
	D. Element D: reporting, monitoring and review	43–49	12
	E. Financial support	50–63	14
	F. Technical support	64–71	17
Annex			
	Timeline of the milestones related to the national adaptation plan process		21

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), at its fortieth session, invited the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) and the Adaptation Committee to prepare an information paper on experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans (NAPs) based on the NAP Expo and relevant documents, including submissions from Parties and relevant organizations, for consideration at SBI 41, as well as to serve as an input to the workshop on this matter to be held prior to SBI 42.[1]

B. Scope

2. The information paper presents the experiences of Parties and relevant organizations of the process to formulate and implement NAPs, as well as good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs based on that experience. In accordance with the mandate for this paper, the information has been drawn from submissions from Parties and relevant organizations,[2] the NAP Expo, held in August 2014, as well as the first NAP Expo held in June 2013,[3] a technical meeting on NAPs held by the LEG in February 2014, a meeting of the Adaptation Committee on monitoring and evaluation held in September 2013, a meeting of the Adaptation Committee's task force on NAPs held in September 2014[4] and a LEG workshop on NAPs for the Pacific region held in November 2014.[5]

3. The paper also includes information on experiences of other adaptation programmes, projects and processes in cases where Parties and relevant organizations have identified these as relevant to the process to formulate and implement NAPs in the various sources referred to in paragraph 2 above. It further includes lessons learned, good practices, gaps and needs. These are not exhaustive and do not represent universally agreed issues by all Parties.

---

[1] FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 107.

[2] Submissions on experiences with the application of the initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs, as well as information relevant to the formulation and implementation of NAPs (22 submissions from Parties (including groups of Parties), and 18 submissions from relevant organizations had been received as at 18 August 2014; see documents FCCC/SBI/2013/9, FCCC/SBI/2014/MISC.1 and FCCC/SBI/2013/MISC.2 and Add.1). Submissions from partner organizations to the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change on good practices in, and lessons learned from, national adaptation planning (18 submissions from relevant organizations and one from a group of organizations had been received as at 20 October 2014; see documents FCCC/SBSTA/2014/MISC.8 and FCCC/SBSTA/2014/4).

[3] The second NAP Expo took place on 8 and 9 August 2014 in Bonn, Germany. Representatives from Parties and relevant organizations gathered to share experiences and to discuss support for the NAP process as well as to identify gaps and needs. More information is available at <http://unfccc.int/8425>.

[4] The Adaptation Committee's task force on NAPs met on 26 and 27 September 2014 in Bonn, with 17 representatives from United Nations agencies, relevant multilateral and bilateral organizations and non-governmental organizations supporting the NAP process to discuss their experiences and to explore how organizations can best support the process. An internal report of the meeting will be made available on the web pages of the Adaptation Committee (<unfccc.int/6053>).

[5] See <http://unfccc.int/8608>.

II. Overview of the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

A. Establishment of the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

4. At its sixteenth session, the Conference of the Parties (COP) established the process to enable the least developed country (LDC) Parties to formulate and implement NAPs and invited other developing country Parties to employ the modalities formulated to support the NAPs.[6]

5. COP 17 adopted the initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs by LDC Parties, which include the following elements: laying the groundwork and addressing gaps; preparatory elements; implementation strategies; and reporting, monitoring and review.[7] In 2012, the LEG, in response to a request from the COP,[8] published technical guidelines for the NAP process.[9] The Adaptation Committee reviewed these technical guidelines and concluded that they are broad and non-prescriptive and therefore flexible enough to also be applied to non-LDC developing countries. It also concluded that in applying the technical guidelines for the NAP process countries should build on the experience of previous adaptation activities and seek to create coherence.[10]

B. Modalities for support

6. COP 17 urged developed country Parties to mobilize financial support for the NAP process for LDC Parties through bilateral and multilateral channels, including through the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), in accordance with decision 1/CP.16.[11]

7. COP 18 requested the Global Environment Facility (GEF), as an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention, as a first step under the NAP process, to provide funding from the LDCF, to meet the agreed full cost, as appropriate, of activities to enable the preparation of the NAP process by the LDC Parties.[12] The COP also requested the GEF, through the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), to consider how to enable activities for the preparation of the NAP process for interested developing country Parties that are not LDCs.[13] In response, the GEF developed a document titled "Operationalizing Support to the Preparation of the National Adaptation Plan Process in Response to Guidance from the UNFCCC COP",[14] which provides an operational basis for supporting the NAP process in eligible developing countries.

8. COP 18 also recognized that the Green Climate Fund (GCF) will support developing countries in pursuing project-based and programmatic approaches in accordance with climate change strategies and plans, such as national adaptation programmes of action

[6] Decision 1/CP.16, paragraphs 15 and 16.
[7] Decision 5/CP.17, paragraph 6 and annex.
[8] Decision 5/CP.17, paragraph 15.
[9] Available in English, French, Portuguese and Spanish at <http://unfccc.int/7279>.
[10] FCCC/SB/2013/2, paragraph 30.
[11] Decision 5/CP.17, paragraph 21. More information on financial and other forms of support to the NAP process is available in document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.25 prepared for SBI 41.
[12] Decision 12/CP.18, paragraph 1(a).
[13] Decision 12/CP.18, paragraph 4.
[14] Available at <www.thegef.org/gef/council_document/operationalizing-supoprt-preparation-national-adaptation-plan-process-response-guid>.

(NAPAs), NAPs and other related activities,[15] as laid out in its governing instrument. According to the same instrument, the GCF, once operational, will provide resources for readiness and preparatory activities and technical assistance, such as the preparation or strengthening of NAPs.[16]

9. Regarding modalities for technical support, COP 17 requested the LEG to provide technical guidance and support to the NAP process in LDCs.[17] In response, the LEG produced the technical guidelines for the NAP process referred to in paragraph 5 above, conducted training workshops on NAPs, created NAP Central as a web portal to support the process and carried out other activities. More information on the guidance and support provided by the LEG to the NAP process is contained in the reports of the LEG to the SBI.[18]

10. The COP requested the Adaptation Committee to be the overall advisory body on adaptation under the Convention[19] and encouraged the Adaptation Committee, in accordance with its agreed functions, to continue its work in developing the relevant modalities for supporting interested developing countries that are not LDC Parties to plan, prioritize and implement their national adaptation planning measures, including through the use of the modalities contained in decision 5/CP.17. As part of its efforts to deliver on this mandate, the Adaptation Committee established a task force on NAPs.[20] The objectives of the Adaptation Committee's task force on NAPs are:[21]

(a) To serve as the panel within the Adaptation Committee that continuously looks at issues related to NAPs;

(b) To liaise with the LEG, upon request, in support of its work with regard to NAPs in the LDCs, ensuring consistence and supplementarity of mandates;

(c) To identify opportunities in which activities can also be employed by non-LDCs;

(d) To follow up on the operationalization of modalities identified for the support of non-LDCs' NAPs under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the Adaptation Committee;

(e) To report to the Adaptation Committee at each of its meetings on issues identified and proposed activities to support the NAP process for all eligible/interested developing countries.

11. More information on the Adaptation Committee's support to the process to formulate and implement NAPs is available in its annual reports to the COP.[22]

12. COP 17 and COP 19 invited United Nations organizations, specialized agencies and other relevant organizations, as well as bilateral and multilateral agencies, to support the NAP process in developing countries, and, where possible, to consider establishing or enhancing support programmes for the NAP process, to facilitate financial and technical support.[23] In response, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), in collaboration with other organizations and

[15] Decision 12/CP.18, preamble.
[16] Decision 3/CP.17, annex.
[17] Decision 5/CP.17, paragraph 13.
[18] FCCC/SBI/2012/7, FCCC/SBI/2012/27, FCCC/SBI/2013/8, FCCC/SBI/2013/15, FCCC/SBI/2014/4 and FCCC/SBI/2014/13.
[19] Decision 2/CP.17, paragraphs 92 and 93.
[20] FCCC/SB/2013/2, paragraph 33, and annex I.
[21] FCCC/SB/2013/2, annex I.
[22] Available at <http://unfccc.int/7584>.
[23] Decision 5/CP.17, paragraph 23, and decision 18/CP.19, paragraph 5.

agencies, established the NAP global support programme for LDCs with funding from the LDCF. The support programme was launched in June 2013.

13. Several developed country Parties have also responded to the invitation from the COP[24] to continue to provide LDC Parties and developing country Parties that are not LDCs with finance, technology and capacity-building for the process to formulate and implement NAPs. These include the European Union and its member States, Germany through the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), the United States of America through the Agency for International Development (USAID) and Japan through the Japan International Cooperation Agency.[25]

14. Various organizations, including the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, UNDP, UNEP, the International Fund for Agricultural Development and the World Health Organization, have communicated ongoing programmes that could directly contribute to various elements of the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

C. Progress on the national adaptation plan process to date

15. A number of developing country Parties have embarked on the process to formulate and implement NAPs through various activities, including stakeholder workshops (e.g. Jamaica, Malawi and the United Republic of Tanzania), the development of road maps (e.g. Bangladesh, Cambodia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Togo), stocktaking exercises (e.g. Cambodia, Lesotho, the Niger and Togo) or even the development of a draft NAP (e.g. Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and the Sudan). Currently, 23 LDCs are participating directly in the NAP global support programme referred to in paragraph 12 above.

16. Furthermore, many developing country Parties are in various stages of undertaking measures on climate change adaptation, such as on institutional arrangements, frameworks, projects, programmes and policies that address some or many activities associated with the process to formulate and implement NAPs. Such activities are already serving as the foundation for the process to formulate and implement NAPs in these countries, and they include the preparation and implementation of NAPAs for the LDCs.

III. Experiences, lessons learned, good practices, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

17. The initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs by LDC Parties are structured into four elements that can be undertaken in the development of NAPs.[26] These are (A) laying the groundwork and addressing gaps, (B) preparatory elements, (C) implementation strategies and (D) reporting, monitoring and review. These elements are used to structure the sections that follow.

18. The gaps and needs presented under each of the sections below may be revisited in the future given that many developing country Parties are undertaking various elements of the process to formulate and implement NAPs, as highlighted in paragraphs 15 and 16 above.

[24] Decision 5/CP.17, paragraph 20.
[25] FCCC/SBI/2014/MISC.1 and FCCC/SBI/2013/MISC.2 and Add.1.
[26] Decision 5/CP.17, annex.

A. Element A: laying the groundwork and addressing gaps

1. Experiences in laying the groundwork and addressing gaps

19. Many LDC Parties that have started to assess arrangements and capacity for coordination and leadership on adaptation have indicated that it is most effective and practical to build on the existing national structures and procedures. They already have institutional arrangements in place that have been established through past and ongoing initiatives. Such arrangements include inter-ministerial climate change committees, multidisciplinary technical teams composed of national experts from government agencies, civil society and local communities, and national climate change secretariats that support day-to-day operations.

20. Despite the existence of such arrangements, many Parties are not yet satisfied with the level of coordination and cooperation among various national ministries, various stakeholders and supporting agencies.

21. The establishment of an appropriate national mandate is one essential means through which countries have advanced long-term leadership and coordination of the process to formulate and implement NAPs. Such mandates have been established in the form of an act, a directive, an executive order or a policy issued by the national government to guide action on adaptation. They help to establish clear responsibilities for government agencies and other stakeholders, and to specify key actions, milestones and outputs for the process.

22. Regarding the stocktaking of available information on climate change and vulnerabilities as well as adaptation activities and gaps and needs, different methods and/or approaches are used to collect and synthesize respective information. These include desk studies, workshops, surveys and information management systems. GIZ has developed the stocktaking for national adaptation planning tool[27] and applied it in several countries.

23. Some important sources of information for the stocktaking exercise include NAPAs; national communications; national climate change strategies, policies, projects and programmes; and multilateral and bilateral programmes such as the Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience, the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA), the Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP) and the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change project.

24. Gaps and needs for the formulation of comprehensive plans, programmes and policies, particularly regarding existing capacity (human, institutional and systemic) and support (financial and technical) are often identified through gaps and needs analyses in the context of ongoing activities. For example, key national policy documents are reviewed to assess the extent to which climate change has been integrated into those documents. Some LDCs have conducted such analyses as part of the design of project proposals for the implementation of NAPAs under the LDCF while identifying the existing baseline of adaptation.

25. In general, countries have reported that the stocktaking exercise has helped them to acknowledge the progress they have already made regarding particular aspects of the process to formulate and implement NAPs and to build on existing activities. Furthermore, the outcomes of the stocktaking have helped to identify key leaders of and contributors to the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

26. Regarding the linkages between adaptation and development, high-level coordination mechanisms for adaptation are reported to best enable the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation across different ministries/agencies, and hence into broader

[27] A factsheet on the SNAP tool is available at <https://gc21.giz.de/ibt/var/app/wp342deP/1443/wp-content/uploads/filebase/ms/mainstreaming-tools/giz-2014_Factsheet-SNAP-EN.pdf>.

national development planning. Furthermore, many countries promote broad participation of different agencies and stakeholders in their general policy process, which further enhances the integration of adaptation.

27. Based on the assessment of existing arrangements, capacity and information, several countries have put in place road maps and/or strategies for the NAP process, defining, among others, specific goals and objectives for the national process, leadership arrangements and the timing of main steps. Some of the road maps already indicate specific timelines for the production of plans, for example, within the first three years of the launching of the process to formulate and implement NAPs, and review periods every five years.

2. Lessons learned and good practices

28. Based on the experiences above, the following lessons learned and good practices have been identified for laying the groundwork and addressing gaps:

(a) Institutional arrangements set up at the highest policy level can ensure that work is coordinated across the different government agencies, that participation of all concerned is encouraged and that required resources are mobilized;

(b) Awareness-raising and consultations among all relevant stakeholders and the communication of the national adaptation strategy and vision to such stakeholders can help to promote synergy and coordination of actions;

(c) Roles and responsibilities between various governance levels need to be clarified to achieve effective integration of adaptation into development planning, for example, through an appropriate national mandate for the process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(d) The stocktaking exercise at multiple levels can be used not only for the identification of existing experiences, best practices and lessons learned in adaptation planning and implementation but also for the strategic identification of key leaders and stakeholders for the process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(e) The process to formulate and implement NAPs presents an opportunity to integrate a 'development first' approach into adaptation planning;

(f) The process to formulate and implement NAPs can bridge the gap between the immediate needs related to current climate and policy priorities and the long-term challenges associated with climate change and socioeconomic development;

(g) The process to formulate and implement NAPs provides an opportunity for developing countries to integrate climate change adaptation into longer-term development planning, across various sectors and different levels of governance;

(h) A smooth integration of the process to formulate and implement NAPs into other development processes, including those for policies and budgets, is important when developing the road map and strategy for the process.

3. Gaps and needs

29. The following gaps and needs have been identified by several countries and organizations regarding laying the groundwork and addressing gaps:

(a) The need to create more political awareness and buy-in for adaptation and leadership at policy-making levels for the process to formulate and implement NAPs in cases where that does not exist already;

(b) The need to enhance and/or establish institutional arrangements for the process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(c) The need to ensure that the activities for laying the groundwork and addressing gaps fully take into account existing national frameworks and processes related to climate change adaptation;

(d) Capacity development training for the management of the process to formulate and implement NAPs (short-term focused training), and long-term in-country support for more diverse stakeholders (experts, practitioners and decision makers);

(e) Enhanced efforts for the management of data, information and knowledge on climate change and relevant development aspects in support of adaptation planning and implementation;

(f) Tools and methods for performing comprehensive assessments, and their application under various steps of the process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(g) Capacity to apply the latest scientific findings and methods in supporting planning and decision-making;

(h) Capacity to effectively link adaptation with development planning.

B. Element B: preparatory elements

1. Experiences regarding preparatory elements

30. Regarding the assessment of medium- and long-term adaptation needs, development needs and climate vulnerabilities, most countries have already conducted the analysis of observed changes in the climate system (e.g. on temperature, precipitation and extremes) and applied climate scenarios for projections in their national communications and other relevant initiatives. Parties have reported that it is challenging to update such scenarios for the process to formulate and implement NAPs using latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) scenarios, and that there are concerns regarding their applicability to specific and/or local contexts such as mountainous regions.

31. Most countries have conducted vulnerability assessments when preparing their national communications. In addition, many LDC Parties have reported that they can build on results from the assessments they have undertaken for their NAPAs. For example, one country sampled pilot areas that are identified as chronic vulnerability areas during the NAPA process, and developed more comprehensive vulnerability maps under its process to formulate and implement NAPs based on that.

32. NAPA preparation has also generated experience among LDCs of appraising and prioritizing adaptation options, generally using cost–benefit analysis and multi-criteria analysis and developing criteria for the prioritization. In general, the experiences gathered through the NAPAs and other adaptation initiatives have been valuable. However, the assessments or appraisals undertaken are not at the level of comprehensiveness that is required for the process to formulate and implement NAPs, either owing to a limited scope of the programme or to financial and technical constraints. In some cases some countries had not undertaken in-depth vulnerability assessments owing to the unavailability of downscaled data at the time.

2. Lessons learned and good practices

33. The following lessons learned and good practices have been identified based on the experiences of countries with the preparatory elements:

(a) The process to formulate and implement NAPs requires comprehensive risk and vulnerability assessments. Some of the assessments undertaken thus far are of a general nature and there is a need for more detailed assessments by regions, sectors, etc.;

(b) Risk frameworks can be used in various sectors and the general methodology is common, even though application in specific areas or sectors requires context-specific data and variables;

(c) The process to formulate and implement NAPs provides opportunities to improve the use of climate information and research for evidence-based decision-making. In this context it is important to recognize that information other than scientific information on climate change needs to be collected to conduct risk and vulnerability assessments, for example, information on local and traditional knowledge for disaster management and socioeconomic information;

(d) Stakeholder consultations, including with local communities and considering gender issues, are an important component of assessments and appraisals for strategic planning.

3. Gaps and needs

34. The following gaps and needs have been identified based on the experiences with preparatory elements:

(a) Capacity to conduct rigorous and comprehensive risk and vulnerability assessments and appraisals of adaptation options. Such required capacity also includes the application of different methodological approaches as new knowledge emerges; the development of an information system at the national level through which downscaled climatic and non-climatic data can be managed; and the application of traditional and local knowledge used to assess vulnerability and future risks and to deal with extreme weather events;

(b) Enhanced understanding of climate risks and impacts for temperature increases of 2°C above pre-industrial levels at the national level, and of costs and benefits of adaptation under such a scenario at the local level;

(c) Climate scenarios using the latest IPCC methods downscaled to different regions and locations;

(d) Enhanced resources for more comprehensive assessments and appraisals of vulnerabilities, risks and adaptation options;

(e) In the context of the initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs, there is a need to provide guidance to possible outputs of the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

C. Element C: implementation strategies

1. Experiences to date with implementation strategies

35. In their submissions and through other forms of communication, Parties and organizations have shared experiences and lessons learned from the implementation of a variety of adaptation programmes and initiatives, which provide a valuable foundation for countries to build on when implementing their NAPs. Some of the relevant strategies or approaches to implementation that have been shared are described in paragraphs 36 to 39 below. They mostly relate to how countries have prioritized work according to

development needs and climate change vulnerabilities and risks and developed appropriate programmes and projects.

36. In implementing NAPAs, LDC Parties have developed individual projects to access funding under the LDCF. In some cases, projects have been funded as part of overarching programmes, including under the Great Green Wall Initiative, the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change programme and a programme on early warning systems in Africa.

37. Under the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR), countries developed the Strategic Program for Climate Resilience (SPCR) in the initial phase of the programme (over a period of 3 to 18 months), which outlines an underlying investment programme for a country. The initial phase has been funded through PPCR grants. SPCR may comprise technical assistance and investment components. It is designed based on the country context and could be focused on one to three sectors or themes, or on a key subregion of the country. Funded actions adopt a programmatic approach where PPCR funds are blended with other resources, including government and/or private-sector resources, and cover the additional costs necessary to make a development activity resilient to the impacts of climate change.[28]

38. Under AAP, countries were allocated approximately USD 3 million to design and implement projects aimed at incorporating climate change risks and opportunities into their national development processes in order to protect development gains from the impacts of climate change.[29]

39. Under GCCA, countries are provided with technical and financial assistance to integrate climate change into their development policies and budgets, and to implement projects that address climate change on the ground, promoting climate-resilient and low-emission development. GCCA works closely with the recipient country to agree on priority areas related to adaptation in which the country needs to make progress in order to receive a tranche of the allocated funds. Funding is then provided through a programme-based approach under which the main financing modality is budget support (general or by sector).[30]

40. Some Parties have established national climate change trust funds to, inter alia, finance the implementation of adaptation priorities at the national level, including public-sector and non-government projects, and to link international finance sources with national investment strategies.

2. Lessons learned and good practices

41. The following lessons learned and good practices have been derived from the experience with implementation strategies:

(a) Careful consideration and planning of the implementation strategy during the NAPA preparation phase has generally led to a smoother transition into the implementation phase – some LDCs have indicated that the absence of early guidelines for the

[28] Further information can be found in Climate Investment Funds. 2009. *Programming and Financing Modalities for the SCF Targeted Program, the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR)*. Available at <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/PPCR_Programming_and_Financing_Modalities.pdf>.

[29] AAP. 2013. *Africa Adaptation Programme: Terminal Report*. Available at <https://www.undp-aap.org/sites/undp-aap.org/files/AAP%20Terminal%20Report.pdf>.

[30] Further information can be found in Council of the European Union. 2008. *Implementation Framework of the Global Climate Change Alliance*. Commission staff working document. Available at <http://www.gcca.eu/sites/default/files/GCCA/gcca_sec20082319_implementation_framework.pdf>.

implementation of NAPAs hindered the development of a comprehensive implementation strategy during the NAPA preparation phase;

(b) NAPA implementation has shown that project-based approaches and individual activities alone will not be sufficient for strategic adaptation planning and that there is a need for a more comprehensive, programmatic and systematic approach that links adaptation with development;

(c) As adaptation requires ongoing action, linking short-term decisions with long-term strategies can lead to a successful pathway;

(d) Regional centres and networks can also play important roles in supporting adaptation strategies for transboundary issues;

(e) Political will and strong institutional arrangements with a certain level of flexibility, as well as synergies with the implementation partners and donors, are required at the national level to establish an effective funding scheme;

(f) Pilot projects must not be designed and implemented without buy-in from major decision makers and beneficiaries;

(g) Use of budget support provides interesting prospects with regard to improving the absorptive capacities of developing countries in the light of future increases of financial support for adaptation. Sector-level support can help to ensure that climate change adaptation is integrated into a country's overall development effort;

(h) The establishment of national climate change trust funds has revealed that government leadership and ownership, strong institutional arrangements, the engagement of all stakeholders and relevant capacity-building at the decision-making levels are key for effective implementation. Challenges include how to ensure the sustainability of the funding mechanisms, and the involvement of the private sector in the implementation of options.

3. Gaps and needs

42. Experience with implementation strategies has revealed the following gaps and needs:

(a) As learning from previous activities and programmes greatly contributes to improved planning and implemenation of adaptation, more comprehensive reviews of past and ongoing programmes and initiatives are needed. Such programmes and initiatives should also be encouraged to share more information about experiences and lessons learned from their work;

(b) There is a need for expanding the initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs to address the implementation of NAPs in order to facilitate the development of comprehensive implementation strategies that are at the right level of ambition with respect to the funding available.

D. Element D: reporting, monitoring and review

1. Experiences to date with reporting, monitoring and review

43. No experience with formal reporting on the progress made and the effectiveness of the process to formulate and implement NAPs through the national communications has been shared to date.

44. Many Parties are considering how to measure outcomes of the process to formulate and implement NAPs, and have reported a lack of guidance on monitoring and review, including on the development of appropriate indicators. Findings from the Adaptation Committee workshop on the monitoring and evaluation of adaptation included that:[31]

(a) Adding up indicators from the local level to get an aggregate number is not necessarily possible or desirable;

(b) National-level assessments could measure aspects of adaptive capacity that are different from those under subnational/project-based assessments, for example the degree of coordination and integration of adaptation into national priorities.

45. The European Union has developed a repository of adaptation indicators for different sectors to support decision makers in designing national monitoring and evaluation systems, and in benchmarking existing national monitoring and evaluation systems for adaptation.

46. The LEG has developed a list of essential functions of the process to formulate and implement NAPs that summarize expected outcomes of a successful process.[32] It is applying these functions in developing a tool that could be used by LDCs to monitor and assess the execution of the process. Such a tool would complement national monitoring and evaluation systems for adaptation.

47. On the review of the NAPs, some LDC Parties have included review cycles of five years on average into their NAP road maps.

2. Lessons learned and good practices

48. The following lessons learned and good practices can be derived from monitoring and review of adaptation:

(a) Monitoring and evaluation processes are important to avoid potential maladaptation, to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of action plans and to understand what works and what does not. They should be integral components of adaptation planning and implementation, as they greatly facilitate learning on adaptation;

(b) It is important to build monitoring and evaluation systems into activities from the start, in order to facilitate the monitoring, review and updating of the process to formulate and implement NAPs over time, and to ensure progress and the effectiveness of adaptation efforts;

(c) Monitoring and evaluation of adaptation is about information management: what is happening on adaptation and what are the results;

(d) Developing a comprehensive national adaptation monitoring and evaluation system is complex. There are many actors involved, it often takes a lot of time, and there is a need to reflect on what can realistically be achieved with limited time and resources;

(e) There does not always need to be a separate monitoring and evaluation system for climate change adaptation. It could build on existing national frameworks by incorporating updates and new indicators to measure adaptation.

[31] The report of the Adaptation Committee workshop on the monitoring and evaluation of adaptation is available at <unfccc.int/7744>.

[32] See FCCC/SBI/2013/15, paragraph 43.

3. Gaps and needs

49. The following gaps and needs have been identified regarding the reporting, monitoring and review:

(a) There is a need to expand the initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs to include the definition of key elements of the expected outcomes, success factors and indicators of the process to formulate and implement NAPs in order to facilitate the implementation of NAPs;

(b) There are gaps in understanding on whether indicators are required to conduct monitoring and evaluation of the process to formulate and implement NAPs. Some countries have highlighted the need for technical papers that could help in discussing the role of adaptation indicators;

(c) There is a need to develop guidelines to address monitoring and evaluation under the process to formulate and implement NAPs, including reporting formats under the Convention;

(d) Parties felt that technical support for monitoring and review is currently insufficient.

E. Financial support

50. This section and the next cover the experiences, lessons learned, good practices, gaps and needs in the provision and receipt of technical and financial support, in the context of the modalities for the process to formulate and implement NAPs outlined in decision 5/CP.17.

1. Experiences with provision and receipt of financial support

51. Parties and relevant organizations have indicated that many programmes and activities that they have been, and are supporting, already contribute to the objectives of the NAP process. Some of these are listed in paragraphs 52–57 below.

52. As part of its implementing modalities, the European Union and its member States provide support to developing country Parties on activities related to different components of the process to formulate and implement NAPs through different modalities. Examples include:

(a) Sector budget support through GCCA such as for climate change adaptation in Bhutan's renewable natural resources sector;

(b) GCCA projects such as the one in Malawi aimed at alleviating poverty through enhancing the resilience of communities at the national and local levels to climate change risks and impacts; and the one in the Pacific small island developing States for supporting efforts in tackling the adverse effects of climate change;

(c) Activities led by the European Union member States such as: the project on supporting the Republic of Moldova's national climate change adaptation planning process, which is funded by Austria; and Germany's support to Cambodia and Togo to undertake activities related to element A (laying the groundwork and addressing gaps) of the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

53. GCCA focuses on mainstreaming climate change into national and sector development planning and budgeting, ensuring that climate change is addressed in a systematic, long-term and sustainable way. GCCA includes the strengthening of public

financial management as part of its programming governance and fiduciary risk assessments.

54. The United States provided support through USAID to various developing country Parties on activities related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs, including the following:

(a) In Jamaica, USAID partnered with the Government in organizing a multi-stakeholder workshop entitled "Climate change: toward the development of a policy framework for Jamaica" to develop inputs for a policy framework to enable Jamaica to achieve the national development goals articulated in its Vision 2030 Jamaica – National Development Plan in the context of climate change;

(b) In the United Republic of Tanzania, USAID partnered with the Government in conducting the workshop entitled "Tanzania coastal climate change national adaptation planning", among other activities, that led to the development of the United Republic of Tanzania's road map and strategy for the process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(c) In West Africa, USAID partnered with the Economic Community of West African States to convene the workshop entitled "West Africa coastal climate change national adaptation planning," which brought together 11 West African States to address various issues related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs.[33]

55. Japan, through AAP, provided USD 92.1 million to 21 countries across Africa to incorporate climate change risks and opportunities into national development processes in order to protect development gains from climate change. AAP was split into an inception planning process (leading to an inception workshop and the planning of the implementation phase, including a timeline) and an implementation phase. National projects were implemented through UNDP country offices in partnership with host governments using the national execution modality.

56. PPCR funds technical assistance and investments to support countries' efforts to integrate climate risks and resilience into core development planning and implementation. As at 2 June 2014, there were eleven pilots participating in PPCR spanning nine stand-alone country pilots and two regional programmes.[34]

57. The Africa Climate Change Fund, a bilateral thematic trust fund with an initial contribution of EUR 4.725 million from Germany, has been established to support African countries in becoming more resilient to climate change, and in transitioning to sustainable low-carbon growth.[35] The fund is hosted and managed by the African Development Bank Group. A first call for grant proposals was launched in August 2014, and technical assistance in the implementation of the process to formulate and implement NAPs was listed as one of the activities that could be funded.

58. Some bilateral organizations have reported that they are receiving very few requests from countries for individual support for the process to formulate and implement NAPs. This stands in contrast to the high number of requests for support under the NAP global support programme.

---

[33] A report on the three workshops is available at <https://static.weadapt.org/knowledge-base/files/1488/541042f231c4cpal00k2tb.pdf>.

[34] Further information can be found in: Climate Investment Funds. 2014. *PPCR Semi-annual Operational Report (Summary)*. Available at <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/PPCR_14_3_PPCR_Semi_Annual_Operational_Report_summary.pdf>.

[35] <http://www.afdb.org/en/topics-and-sectors/initiatives-partnerships/africa-climate-change-fund/>.

59. Organizations and agencies have also reported that they each face limits regarding the support they can provide to the process to formulate and implement NAPs given their respective organizational mandate, set-up and resource constraints, particularly in the light of the long-term nature of the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

60. Many Parties have indicated that there is lack of clarity on procedures to apply for funding from the LDCF and the SCCF for the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

61. Some Parties have also indicated that both funds are based on voluntary contributions, and suffer from inadequate and unpredictable financing, and therefore pose barriers to further scaling up and mainstreaming adaptation into national development planning.

2. Lessons learned and good practices

62. The following lessons and good practices can be derived from the provision and receipt of financial support:

(a) The process to formulate and implement NAPs is an ongoing and iterative process that can be implemented through components which can be supported by different sources of funding. Paragraphs 52–57 above provide examples of how the different components of the process to formulate and implement NAPs are being or can be supported. Different sectoral funding streams at the national level could be combined in order to finance the process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(b) Regarding the limited number of requests from countries to bilateral and other sources for individual support for the process to formulate and implement NAPs, more political awareness and buy-in for the process needs to be created at the national level to generate such requests. Packaging information about the process to formulate and implement NAPs into different types of messages that would reach particular target groups (government, national and local levels, financial institutions, etc.) and exploring NAPs in the wider economic context, including the relevance of the private sector, might be effective approaches;

(c) Experiences of other adaptation initiatives show that closer synergies are required among adaptation funds. In the future, this will be particularly true for the LDCF, the SCCF, the Adaptation Fund and the GCF. Coordination is also required among the various readiness support programmes currently under way to prepare countries for the access to and management of funding from the GCF. In particular, the GCF itself should be encouraged to enhance coordination of its support and readiness programme with those of others as well as with the constituted bodies under the Convention in order to effectively prepare countries for accessing GCF funding for the implementation of NAPs;

(d) Lessons learned under GCCA include that the use of budget support provides means to improve the absorptive capacity of developing countries, and that the dialogue and exchange of experiences and cooperation through country and regional interventions promotes the transfer of knowledge from the field, informing the international climate change debate and decision-making at the highest level;

(e) In its terminal report, AAP noted that there is great need for countries to gain basic knowledge of existing financial mechanisms and how to gain access to them; that it was erroneous to expect that funds would be mobilized for climate change adaptation at the national level; and that strict eligibility criteria could serve as barriers to accessing funds;[36]

[36] The report is available at <http://www.undp-aap.org/sites/undp-aap.org/files/AAP%20Terminal%20Report.pdf>.

(f) PPCR experience shows that institutional and intergovernmental coordination is essential, including a strong lead ministry, such as a ministry of finance or planning. Consultations in the early phase can enhance engagement and communication among stakeholders and increased ownership, while a difference remains between consultations and consensus;

(g) There are challenges with regard to managing bilateral support due to various factors, including bilateral arrangements between the agencies and recipient countries, and between the different agencies and organizations and the different reporting requirements.

3. Gaps and needs

63. Gaps and needs regarding financial support include the following:

(a) Communication and awareness with regard to further facilitating access to the LDCF and the SCCF as well as access to other types of financial support, including through regional training workshops on NAPs conducted by the LEG and the dialogue of the Adaptation Committee with relevant organizations and agencies;

(b) Provision of scaled-up, adequate and additional resources to the LDCF and the SCCF, and to the GCF in the context of its initial capitalization, to meet the needs of developing countries, particularly LDCs, small island developing States and countries in Africa affected by drought and desertification, for the process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(c) Capacity to access the GCF through coordinated readiness programmes, including the nomination of focal points or national designated authorities; creating or strengthening a strategic framework for engagement and a work programme; developing an initial pipeline of programme and project proposals for the implementation of NAPs; and selecting intermediaries or implementing entities and building their capacity;

(d) Sufficient preliminary knowledge, such as on the understanding of climate finance shortcomings and the development of strategies and methodologies in establishing functional financing mechanisms for climate change adaptation;

(e) Capacity to analyse additional costs of climate change risks, vulnerabilities and impacts;

(f) Improved communication and outreach on available support;

(g) Regarding the different operational constraints that organizations and agencies face in providing support, support needs to be better coordinated and communicated, and opportunities need to be explored on how the support can be provided in a complementary manner. A specific proposal in this context is that the GEF resources that, due to their nature, tend to be provided for the short term, could be complemented by bilateral or other multilateral funding that is disbursed based on longer-term bilateral or multilateral country strategies with the respective partner organization. The process to formulate and implement NAPs can provide a platform for such coordination of support.

F. Technical support

1. Experiences to date with provision and receipt of technical support

64. Parties have welcomed the work of the LEG on the provision of technical guidance and support to LDCs on the NAP process, and the work of the Adaptation Committee on consideration of modalities for supporting developing country Parties that are not LDCs.[37]

[37] FCCC/SBI/2013/20, paragraph 106, and FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 100.

LDC Parties particularly emphasize the value of the regional training workshops on NAPs conducted by the LEG, which allow for intensive consultations and exchange of experience between participants from the same region. Organizations and country representatives that participated in the Adaptation Committee's workshop on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation and the meeting of the Adaptation Committee's task force on NAPs underlined the value of such meetings that allowed for the exchange of experience on a focused set of questions.

65. The first in a new round of regional training workshops on NAPs by the LEG was held in November 2014 for the Pacific LDCs.[38] Participants valued the exchange of national experiences on adaptation and discussed how they could build on existing adaptation programmes in undertaking the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

66. Parties and relevant organizations have indicated that there are many channels through which technical support is provided to developing country Parties on activities that could contribute to or fall under the process to formulate and implement NAPs.

67. Bilateral and multilateral support includes a blend of financial and technical support in supporting countries on adaptation planning and implementation. Technical components of the support include:

(a) Technical support for the design and implementation of adaptation programmes, projects and policies such as in the case of the LDCF, the SCCF, GCCA, PPCR, AAP and other programmes;

(b) Design and implementation of national initiatives to raise awareness of adaptation planning and implementation;

(c) Building the capacity for fiduciary and financial management, such as in the case of GCCA;

(d) Conducting assessments, including risk and vulnerability assessments, vulnerability and adaptation assessments, appraisal of adaptation options and prioritization and ranking;

(e) Integration of adaptation into national development processes;

(f) Design of monitoring and evaluation systems.

68. Parties have welcomed the establishment of the NAP global support programme for LDCs for facilitating technical support to the LDC Parties, which involved the creation of a support mechanism around three main pillars: institutional support, technical support and knowledge brokering.[39] The programme conducted regional training workshops for Asian LDCs in February 2014 and for anglophone and francophone African LDCs in April 2014, and collaborated with the LEG in conducting a regional training workshop on NAPs for the Pacific LDCs. It has supported specific in-country activities ranging from stocktaking and gaps and needs analyses to broader aspects of laying the groundwork for the process to formulate and implement NAPs, and provided technical reviews of draft NAPs and road maps of some LDCs.[40]

2. Lessons learned and good practices

69. The following lessons and good practices have been identified regarding the provision and receipt of technical support:

[38] See <http://unfccc.int/8608>.
[39] Decision 18/CP.19, paragraph 3.
[40] Further details are contained in document FCCC/SBI/2014/13, paragraph 15.

(a) Regional training workshops, such as the ones provided by the LEG or the NAP Global Support Programme, are an effective means of providing training and capacity-building on adaptation to LDCs. The modality provides countries with the opportunity to come together and learn from each other and engage with the LEG as well as international and regional organizations, and to explore how to build on existing regional activities and programmes in designing the process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(b) Meetings such as the one conducted by the Adaptation Committee's task force on NAPs in September 2014 and the technical meeting on NAPs convened by the LEG in February 2014 provide an effective platform for targeted exchanges;

(c) The initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs and the LEG's technical guidelines for the NAP process provide a basis for undertaking the process to formulate and implement NAPs. Numerous other guidance materials exist for various components of adaptation planning, and these can be used as supplementary materials for specific steps of the process to formulate and implement NAPs. However, some Parties highlighted the potential confusion that could be brought about regarding the different guidelines from the various organizations, and emphasized that better coordination is required in order to support Parties in selecting the appropriate guiding material. The SBI subsequently encouraged the organizations to ensure the alignment of the supplements with the technical guidelines for the NAP process;[41]

(d) Collaboration by the LEG with the GEF and its agencies in supporting LDCs facilitates timely identification of the challenges faced, and provides an opportunity for exploring ways and means to address those challenges as a way to facilitate progress;

(e) The process to formulate and implement NAPs is essentially a learning process for all involved. There is no 'one size fits all' approach for the process to formulate and implement NAPs nor can specific steps or approaches be prescribed. Institutionalizing learning and the exchange of experience and lessons learned among countries, regions and organizations is therefore key.

3. Gaps and needs

70. The following gaps and needs have been identified regarding technical support for the process to formulate and implement NAPs:

(a) The urgent need for capacity-building in relation to the process to formulate and implement NAPs, not only for the climate change focal points but also for other government agencies that will be part of the process;

(b) More outreach materials for use by relevant stakeholders in raising awareness and creating buy-in for the process to formulate and implement NAPs at all levels, especially at the policy level, and to show how countries can build on existing adaptation activities in undertaking their process to formulate and implement NAPs;

(c) Better coordination and coherence of support and other aspects of the process to formulate and implement NAPs at key levels, which could be addressed through meetings such as the one conducted by the Adaptation Committee's task force on NAPs in September 2014;

(d) The development of properly managed data and information systems, which would serve as the basis for science-based planning and decision-making;

(e) The development and application of climate change scenarios based on the latest IPCC methodologies and in the context of a global temperature goal;

[41] FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 86

(f) Gaps in knowledge on theories of change on achieving the objectives of the process to formulate and implement NAPs, which could guide the development of effective processes as well as monitoring and evaluation systems;

(g) Further gaps and needs that could be addressed through the following activities by the Adaptation Committee in line with its mandate and workplan, including through its task force on NAPs, include: (i) engaging with institutions that have started initiatives on countries' readiness to access the GCF and exploring how more countries can benefit from such initiatives; (ii) exploring NAPs in the wider economic context, including the relevance of the private sector; (iii) engaging with the GEF and the GCF, as well as other bodies, to advance the effective provision of finance and other means of implementation; (iv) sharing information on success factors in the process to formulate and implement NAPs, including through case studies, and (v) reaching out to strategic partners of the process to formulate and implement NAPs, including academia, the media and regional institutions, and bringing together and enhancing their specific strengths;

(h) Further gaps and needs that could be addressed through the work of the LEG in line with its mandate and work programme, in collaboration with relevant organizations, include: (i) capacity-building on all aspects of the process to formulate and implement NAPs on a continuous basis given the evolving nature of adaptation and the long-term horizon of the process to formulate and implement NAPs, such as through training workshops at the regional level,[42] including for training of trainers, and at the national levels by relevant partner organizations; (ii) capacity-building on how to access the LDCF and SCCF and on how to build readiness to access GCF support through focused clinics during the training workshops on NAPs; (iii) need for more targeted meetings of the LEG with the participation of relevant experts to look deeper into the technical aspects of the process to formulate and implement NAPs; (iv) the need for continued engagement of advisory groups in regional training workshops with the LEG to further explore and address regional technical capacity needs and as a means of providing continuity and follow-up to the training; (v) the compilation of countries' experiences of undertaking the process to formulate and implement NAPs through case studies, taking into account the relevant work under the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, as a means of identifying measures aimed at addressing further needs for technical support.

71. In general, technical support should be extended to cover the implementation of NAPs as well as the reporting, monitoring and review of the process.

[42] See document FCCC/SBI/2013/16, paragraph 61, for topics that could be included in such workshops.

Annex

Timeline of the milestones related to the national adaptation plans

2010 **Decision 1/CP.16**: The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention

- Established the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans

2011 **Decision 5/CP.17**: National adaptation plans

- Objectives of the national adaptation plan (NAP) process; adopting initial guidelines, modalities and financial arrangements for the least developed countries (LDCs); deciding modalities for non-LDCs; referring to reporting, monitoring and evaluation
- Identified what the NAP process seeks to achieve: reduction of vulnerability and integration of adaptation into development
- Laid out initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs
- Requested the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) to prepare technical guidelines for the NAP process
- Urged developed countries to mobilize financial support for the NAP process in LDCs through bilateral and multilateral channels, including the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)
- Invited United Nations, specialized, bilateral and multilateral agencies to establish NAP support programmes to facilitate financial and technical support
- Encouraged LDCs to provide information on their NAP process through their national communications as well as other channels
- Requested the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to consider how to enable activities through the LDCF for the preparation of the NAP process for LDCs

Decision 3/CP.17: Launching the Green Climate Fund

- The Green Climate Fund will provide resources for readiness and preparatory activities, including NAPs
- It will support developing countries in pursuing project-based and programmatic approaches in accordance with climate change strategies and plans, such as NAPs and other related activities

2012 **Decision 12/CP.18**: National adaptation plans

- Decided that the GEF would provide financial support to LDCs from the LCDF to enable activities for the preparation of the NAP process
- Urged developed country Parties to mobilize financial support for the NAP process for interested non-LDC developing country Parties through bilateral and multilateral channels, including through the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)
- Requested the GEF to consider how to enable activities through the SCCF for the preparation of the NAP process for non-LDC developing countries
- Decided to assess the progress made in implementing this decision, and to consider adoption of further guidance, as appropriate, at the twentieth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP)

LEG:

- The LEG included sessions on NAPs in its regional workshops on adaptation for LDCs
- The LEG convened a technical meeting to review draft technical guidelines for the NAP process
- The LEG released technical guidelines for the NAP process

2013 **GEF document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.14/06**: *Operationalizing Support to the Preparation of the National Adaptation Plan Process in Response to Guidance from the UNFCCC COP*, produced in response to decision 12/CP.18

LEG:

- NAP Expo: Launching of the NAP process in LDCs

NAP global support programme for LDCs:

- Launching of the NAP global support programme for LDCs developed by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Decision 18/CP.19: National adaptation plans

- Invited United Nations, specialized, bilateral and multilateral agencies to consider establishing or enhancing NAP support programs for non-LDC developing countries
- Decided to continue to take stock of the NAP process at COP 20

GEF:

- The LDCF/SCCF Council endorsed guidelines for funding the NAPs that were prepared by the GEF secretariat in response to COP guidance

Adaptation Committee:

- The Adaptation Committee established a task force on NAPs

2014 **NAP global support programme for the LDCs**: Regional training workshops on the NAP process for Asia and anglophone and francophone African countries

LEG:

- The LEG convened a technical meeting on NAPs that worked on a sample NAP process
- NAP Expo: catalysing actions and support for the NAP process
- LEG training workshop on NAPs for the Pacific

Adaptation Committee:

- The Adaptation Committee's task force on NAPs held a two-day meeting in late September with representatives from United Nations agencies, relevant multilateral and bilateral organizations and non-governmental organizations supporting the NAP process to share experiences and discuss how the NAP process can best be supported

GEF and United Nations agencies:

- To date, three Project Identification Forms have been received by the GEF for funding under the LDCF for NAP support at the national level. Countries have also requested support from the NAP global support programme, which provides three types of support – in-country targeted support, regional technical workshops and knowledge brokering through an online portal
- To date, UNDP and UNEP have jointly held four regional workshops under the NAP global support programme to support LDCs in the preparation of their NAP process
- To date, 27 LDCs had requested in-country targeted support from the NAP global support programme, and UNDP/UNEP have stated that all LDCs will probably be receiving this type of support by early 2015 (pending final approval of GEF funds)
- A NAP global support programme for non-LDCs, funded by the SCCF, is currently in the final stages of project approval and is expected to become operational in early 2015.

Bilateral support:

- Germany, Switzerland and the United States of America are currently exploring the possibility of bilateral cooperation on the process to formulate and implement NAPs

United Nations

Framework Convention on Climate Change

FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.15

Distr.: General
16 October 2014

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Forty-first session
Lima, 1–8 December 2014

Item 4(b) of the provisional agenda
Reporting from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention
Work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention

Progress report on the work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention: long-term strategy of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention

Note by the secretariat

Summary

This document contains the long-term strategy (2015–2018) of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention, its vision and goals, and the means and way forward for achieving those goals.

GE.14-18765 (E)

1418765

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Context	1–20	3
	A. Background and mandate	1–5	3
	B. Key challenges faced by the Consultative Group of Experts	6–10	3
	C. Evolving capacity-building needs	11–17	4
	D. Other ongoing initiatives to support capacity-building	18–20	5
II.	Vision	21–22	6
III.	Goals	23	6
IV.	Strategies	24–43	6
	A. Strategy 1.1: build the capacity of developing country Parties to facilitate the implementation of measurement, reporting and verification arrangements under the Convention	25–27	6
	B. Strategy 1.2: build the capacity of developing country Parties to facilitate the implementation of measurement, reporting and verification arrangements under the Convention	28–30	8
	C. Strategy 2: enhance the sustainability of the national communication and biennial update report process	31–34	9
	D. Strategy 3: ensure availability of resources and optimal working arrangements for the operations of the Consultative Group of Experts	35–37	10
	E. Strategy 4: enhance collaboration and cooperation with other global initiatives	38–40	11
	F. Strategy 5: enhance communication and outreach	41–43	12
V.	Implementation – going forward	44–46	13
Annex			
	Template for the annual work programme of the Consultative Group of Experts		14

I. Context

A. Background and mandate

1. The objective of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE) is to improve the process of and preparation of national communications (NCs) and biennial update reports (BURs) by Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties) by providing technical advice and support to such Parties as well as to build the capacity of technical experts nominated to the UNFCCC roster of experts for the technical analysis of BURs under the international consultation and analysis process.

2. It operates according to its rules of procedure, which were revised following the nineteenth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP).[1] The COP, by decision 19/CP.19, decided to continue the CGE for a period of five years from 2014 to 2018 and that it should function in accordance with the revised terms of reference contained in the annex to that decision. By the same decision, the COP decided that the membership of the CGE should be the same as set out in decision 3/CP.8, annex, paragraphs 3–8.

3. Also by decision 19/CP.19, the COP requested the CGE to submit annually a progress report on its work to the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) for consideration by the SBI at its sessions held in conjunction with the sessions of the COP. In addition, the COP decided to review the mandate and terms of reference of the CGE at COP 22, with a view to adopting a relevant decision at that session. Furthermore, the COP requested the secretariat to facilitate the work of the CGE by providing relevant administrative, logistical and technical support.

4. SBI 39 took note of the recommendations contained in the progress report of the CGE, including on a long-term perspective,[2] which could be useful in further enhancing the effectiveness of the provision of technical assistance to non-Annex I Parties in meeting their reporting requirements. It encouraged the CGE to take into consideration those recommendations, as appropriate, in developing its work programme.[3]

5. As a result, the CGE, in defining its work programme for 2014,[4] decided to develop a long-term strategy for 2015–2018.

B. Key challenges faced by the Consultative Group of Experts

6. The CGE has been developing and delivering various training programmes to non-Annex I Parties addressing different themes in relation to NCs and BURs. However, there is still a great need and demand to enhance the national capacities of non-Annex I Parties to prepare their NCs and BURs, including the preparation of their national greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories, with a focus on putting in place sustainable institutional arrangements. Owing to the cross-cutting nature of climate change issues across many different sectors and disciplines, dealing with them requires coordination among a wide range of national

[1] The revised rules of procedure are available at <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/non-annex_i_natcom/cge/application/pdf/revised_rules_of_procedure_cge_2014.pdf>.

[2] FCCC/SBI/2013/17, paragraphs 51–54.

[3] FCCC/SBI/2013/20, paragraph 25.

[4] The work programme of the CGE for 2014 is available at <www.unfccc.int/2608.php>.

institutions and other stakeholders. This requires a great deal of interdisciplinary knowledge enhancement and communication at the national level, something which is not always easily attainable in the classic set-up of ministries each being responsible for one specific national sector.

7. Non-Annex I Parties continue to face challenges in establishing and maintaining institutional arrangements on a continuous basis. This hinders the ability of Parties to fulfil their reporting requirements under the Convention as a result of loss of capacity built, lessons learned, experiences and institutional memory, inefficient management of the data and information necessary for reporting, and lack of outreach and awareness. Experience shows that the countries that have benefited the most from workshops and training seminars are those that appointed their representatives to attend them with an eye to the long term, giving the learning opportunity to national experts who will be able to carry out technical work on a continuous basis in the future, and providing incentives and career opportunities.

8. The 'one size fits all' approach is not sufficient when developing training materials. The materials need to be designed taking into account differing national and/or regional circumstances and capabilities and be better tailored to suit participants with differing levels of knowledge and expertise. The training materials also need to be revised regularly to reflect the most recent science and any developments in the reporting of developing country Parties under the Convention.

9. Despite its clear achievements over the years, the CGE has been facing uncertainties over the continuation of the group and the lack of stable and predictable financial resources to support the implementation of its work programme. This is further compounded by the fact that the CGE members assume their role in addition to their national duties.

10. Future COP decisions relating to reporting under the Convention may need to include mandates, to which the CGE may respond, for the provision of additional capacity-building support to developing country Parties.

C. Evolving capacity-building needs

11. Over time, requirements to fulfil reporting obligations mandated under the Convention and by relevant COP decisions have evolved. To address those evolving requirements, analytical methodologies are becoming more powerful and complex and, as a consequence, national measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) system requirements for developing countries are also evolving. As a result, there is a need for continued capacity development in order for national teams to best use such methodologies and fulfil those reporting requirements.

12. International support provided to non-Annex I Parties has contributed to the development of those Parties' capacities to fulfil their reporting requirements. However, over time, the development of those capacities in each country has been moving at different speeds. The reality today is that some Parties are further ahead than others in terms of the capacity to develop their NCs and BURs; hence, capacity-building needs vary considerably from Party to Party. Experience with the National Communications Support Programme (NCSP)[1] has shown that generic regional workshops are becoming less effective owing to different national capacity-building needs and that, overall, capacity-building needs are, for example, moving from concerning merely developing high-quality GHG inventories to filling data gaps and improving the quality of the inventories. Experience with NCSP has also shown that significant capacity gaps still exist for developing country Parties that are small island developing States or least developed countries.

[1] See <http://ncsp.undp.org>.

13. The recent COP decisions[6] requiring non-Annex I Parties to submit NCs every four years and BURs every two years have resulted in a vast increase in capacity-building needs, at both the individual and institutional levels. The decisions are putting pressure on developing country Parties to produce high-quality reports in a timely manner, which, particularly in the case of the BURs, will be subject to technical analysis by a team of technical experts (TTE).

14. In addition, countries are increasingly recognizing that the benefits of developing GHG inventories and conducting vulnerability and adaptation and mitigation assessments go far beyond merely satisfying their reporting requirement. Increasingly, developing countries are transforming this mere reporting process into a strategic and policy support tool to meet their needs for national planning and decision-making.

15. The COP, by decision 1/CP.17, launched a process to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties, referred to as the 2015 agreement, which should be adopted at COP 21 at the latest and come into effect and be implemented from 2020. In that context, the COP, by decision 1/CP.19, invited all Parties to initiate or intensify the domestic preparation of their intended nationally determined contributions and to communicate them well in advance of COP 21 in a manner that facilitates the clarity, transparency and understanding of the intended contributions, without prejudice to the legal nature of the contributions.

16. Furthermore, it is likely that the existing MRV arrangements for both developed and developing country Parties will evolve, in one form or another, as a result of the discussions on transparency of action and support taking place under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action in the context of the 2015 agreement.

17. The intended nationally determined contributions and transparency of action and support referred to in paragraphs 15 and 16 above are envisaged as an integral part of the 2015 agreement and hence are of a long-term nature. They are expected to create additional capacity-building needs for developing country Parties.

D. Other ongoing initiatives to support capacity-building

18. Under the guidance of the COP, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) – an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention – helps developing countries to undertake win-win projects, including those that reduce emissions of GHGs and promote sustainable development. It also provides financial support to non-Annex I Parties for preparing their NCs and BURs. Currently, the GEF and its partners, namely the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), are implementing the Global Support Programme (GSP), a programme similar to NCSP, to provide technical and financial support to non-Annex I Parties for developing their NCs and BURs.

19. The process of preparing the 2015 agreement launched at COP 19 requires Parties to the Convention to submit their intended nationally determined contributions by March 2015. In that context, the GEF has allocated funds for a project titled "Nationally Determined Contributions to the 2015 Agreement under the UNFCCC", which aims to support participating countries in identifying, preparing and communicating their intended nationally determined contributions in the context of the 2015 agreement.

20. Other multilateral and bilateral agencies are also financing and/or supporting many multilateral and bilateral initiatives on the ground that support developing countries in setting up and/or enhancing their MRV systems.

[6] Decisions 1/CP.16 and 2/CP.17.

II. Vision

21. Mandated by the COP, the CGE works towards providing technical support and advice in an effective, adequate and sustainable manner that significantly contributes to Parties' efforts in implementing an MRV framework under the Convention for developing country Parties.

22. That vision puts the CGE on a path to addressing the technical assistance needs of developing country Parties in meeting their reporting requirements under the Convention and to improving the technical analysis of BURs in a more objective and structured manner. The vision and strategies of the CGE respond to the needs, problems, constraints and challenges faced by developing country Parties as a result of the enhanced and evolving MRV requirements under the Convention and also address the challenges that the CGE faces in the execution of its mandate.

III. Goals

23. The overarching strategic goals of the CGE are:

(a) To support developing country Parties in fulfilling their reporting requirements under the Convention on a continuous basis by building their national capacities for the process of and preparation of NCs and BURs;

(b) To establish an environment that enables it to continue providing the technical assistance, support and advice mandated by the COP in an effective, adequate and sustainable manner, taking into consideration the challenges that it faces and potential new tasks that may be assigned to it by the COP.

IV. Strategies

24. The CGE has developed a set of strategies that is geared towards achieving its strategic goals. The strategies have been identified and developed on the basis of a needs analysis, further supplemented by the lessons learned and experiences gained by the CGE in delivering its mandate. They are formulated to respond to the needs, problems, constraints and challenges faced by developing country Parties in fulfilling their reporting requirements under the Convention and to address the emerging challenges that the CGE faces in implementing its mandate. They also cover various aspect of the work of the CGE, such as: (a) the provision of technical assistance, including capacity-building and technical support and advice; (b) operational management, including necessary resources, intersessional working modalities, and communication and outreach; and (c) collaboration and interaction by the CGE with other capacity-building initiatives.

A. Strategy 1.1: build the capacity of developing country Parties to facilitate the implementation of measurement, reporting and verification arrangements under the Convention

25. The aim of this strategy is to design and deliver capacity-building initiatives, targeting both individuals and institutions that match country-specific needs and local context and taking into account the evolving reporting needs of Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention, in a comprehensive and cost-effective manner.

26. Building on the experience acquired since it was established in 1999, the CGE will pursue its mandate of supporting non-Annex I Parties in developing their national capacities to fulfil their reporting requirements under the Convention. In doing so, the group will take into account the evolving nature of those reporting requirements and the specific needs stemming from differing national circumstances and respective capabilities. The CGE will support capacity development activities, including by developing training materials and developing and delivering sustainable, effective and low-cost delivery mechanisms.

27. To implement this strategy, the CGE will:

(a) Conduct a needs analysis: this would entail taking stock of the available training resources, identifying the target audience of training activities, identifying the generic requirements for the preparation of NCs and BURs and ascertaining the key considerations in reflecting differing national circumstances. The outcomes of the analysis, at the individual, organizational and systemic levels, would form the basis for the design and delivery of subsequent training activities. Such an analysis should be conducted on a periodic basis to take into account the evolving nature of the reporting requirements implied by the latest COP decisions as well as the progression of capacity-building in the countries;

(b) Design and develop a training programme: it is important to set the objectives and expectations clearly right from the beginning in order to guide and focus the design and development of the training programme. This includes identifying the target audience and defining the substantive theme and scope of the training and delivery methods. Depending on the needs analysis, it may be more efficient and effective to develop training programmes with differing themes and levels of substantive depth tailored to different target audiences. The CGE would also develop products that indirectly contribute to capacity-building, learning-by-doing or on-the-job learning. Such products could include user manuals, toolkits, standards, accounts of good practices and lessons learned, guidelines, etc;

(c) Deliver training: the mode of or approach to the delivery of the intended training will be largely determined by the objective, expectation and target audience, which influence the scope, nature and depth of the training materials. The availability of financial resources and the practicality of each mode or approach are also aspects that need to be taken into consideration. In general, there are a number of approaches to delivering the training, some of which are already being used extensively by the CGE:

(i) In-person workshops, mainly for training that aims to cover in-depth scientific and methodological themes and involves practical and hands-on exercises. The target audience of the training would be mainly experts and trainers;

(ii) Different forms of e-learning, such as free-standing electronic materials simply hosted on a website, interactive web-based materials, moderated online bulletin boards, and recordings of in-person workshop sessions (lectures, demonstrations and exercises). This mode of training is appropriate for refresher courses, where basic background training is offered to a broader set of stakeholders involved in climate change activities at the national level. The free-standing electronic materials could also support educational efforts in national educational institutes;

(iii) Webinars and webcasts of in-person workshops, which have the potential to deliver training to a broader set of stakeholders at the national level at low cost. The webinar sessions could target training on a specific issue under a theme by providing a platform for national experts and practitioners to interact with resource persons. In addition, webcasts of in-person workshops would be a good medium to reach out to

a larger group of national experts to enhance their awareness and allow them to gain basic background knowledge;

(iv) Collaboration with regional centres of excellence and academia, whereby the CGE could assist in designing and developing training curricula for sustainable long-term professional development programmes, such as undergraduate and postgraduate university courses and programmes;

(d) Create an enabling environment: the scope and scale of the capacity needs of non-Annex I Parties is so vast that the CGE alone will never be in a position to fully meet the demands. This challenge can be addressed to a large extent by taking advantage of the interests within multilateral and bilateral entities with regard to supporting non-Annex I Parties. The CGE could play a key role in providing strategic guidance and direction to those entities to ensure that their capacity-building efforts are approached in a strategically coordinated manner, with a view to achieving synergy and complementarity among different initiatives. In this respect, the CGE could:

(i) Identify a road map to provide strategic guidance and direction for the capacity-building of non-Annex I Parties to enable the implementation of the MRV arrangements for developing country Parties under the Convention. The primary target of such a strategic product would be multilateral and bilateral agencies, academic institutes and other regional centres of excellence that are either already involved, or are planning to get involved, in supporting countries' capacity-building initiatives;

(ii) Develop information products, such as user manuals, factsheets, case studies, databases of support and resources available, etc., to facilitate access to financial and technical resources as well as support for the preparation of NCs and BURs, and make that information available to non-Annex I Parties via various web-based platforms;

(e) Enhance networking and peer exchange: the CGE will promote and enhance networking and peer exchange among national experts involved in South–South and North–South cooperation and other experts from the research and international communities by providing an appropriate platform.

B. Strategy 1.2: build the capacity of developing country Parties to facilitate the implementation of measurement, reporting and verification arrangements under the Convention

28. The aim of this strategy is to design and deliver capacity-building initiatives that respond to the needs of the team of technical experts undertaking the technical analysis of biennial update reports (BURs) under the international consultation and analysis process, while at the same time taking into account the difficulties encountered by non-Annex I Parties in the preparation of their BURs.

29. As stated in its terms of reference, the CGE is to provide guidance and periodic advice to the secretariat to assist it in fulfilling the selection criteria for the composition of the TTE in accordance with decision 20/CP.19. The CGE will develop and organize, with the assistance of the secretariat, appropriate training programmes for nominated technical experts, beginning in 2014. The training will focus on improving the capacity of such experts to conduct technical analyses of BURs, taking into account the difficulties encountered by non-Annex I Parties in the preparation of their BURs.

30. To implement this strategy, the CGE will:

(a) Conduct a needs analysis: it will engage with the experts that: (i) have been nominated to the UNFCCC roster of experts; (ii) have completed the CGE training programme for the TTE; and (iii) have participated in the technical analysis of BURs, in order to understand and garner feedback on the expectations of the experts and the impacts of the training programme with respect to building their capacity;

(b) Identify effective training delivery mechanisms: in order to deliver an effective training programme, the CGE will identify efficient and effective training delivery mechanisms to reach out easily to a broad base of national experts;

(c) Adjust the training programme, including materials and delivery mode: on the basis of the needs analysis, the training programme developed in 2014 will be adjusted to ensure that it responds to the needs of the TTE in conducting technical analyses of BURs submitted by non-Annex I Parties and takes into account the difficulties encountered by those Parties in preparing their NCs and BURs;

(d) Guide the selection of the TTE: the CGE will provide guidance and periodic advice to the secretariat to assist it in fulfilling the selection criteria for the composition of the TTE and take stock of the challenges that the secretariat encounters in composing the team and provide recommendations to the SBI and the secretariat on addressing those challenges.

C. Strategy 2: enhance the sustainability of the national communication and biennial update report process

31. The aim of this strategy is to assist Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention in enhancing the sustainability of their national communication and biennial update report process.

32. In recent years, the reporting requirements for developing country Parties under the Convention, in terms of both substantive content and frequency, have been enhanced. Furthermore, developing country Parties are increasingly transforming the reporting process into a strategic and policy support tool to meet their needs for national planning, policymaking and decision-making.[7] Many Parties face complex situations in which data may be non-existent for various reasons, including unclear institutional responsibilities, difficulties in accessing the data, lack of human and institutional capacities or civil unrest. It is important that countries are aware of data gaps and have access to solutions for addressing them, which often involve extrapolation, enhancing existing data collection and archiving systems, the use of expert judgment or deriving data from other existing sources.

33. Hence, it has become essential for countries to have an NC and BUR process that is sustainable and functioning on a continuous basis. In that context, the CGE will support non-Annex I Parties in enhancing and maintaining the sustainability of their NC and BUR process. This broader approach will be integrated into the CGE training programme, taking into account the broader role of the NC and BUR process within national development.

34. To implement this strategy, the CGE will:

(a) Develop tools and guidance materials that facilitate: (i) setting up and enhancing robust institutional arrangements that function on a continuous basis; and (ii) enhancing access to financial, technical and capacity-building resources. Tools and guidance materials could be developed for, among other things, gaps and needs analysis,

[7] A survey conducted for the terminal evaluation of NCSP revealed that 71 per cent of the respondents said that the tools and methods used to develop their NCs were already used to integrate climate change into their national policies.

documentation of institutional arrangements, templates for legal or official arrangements, generic sample terms of reference for the coordinating agency, sectoral teams and data providers, mapping the minimum institutional arrangements necessary to be able to sufficiently fulfil the reporting requirements, and strategies and guidance materials to promote and enhance awareness among stakeholders, including key policymakers and political leaders;

(b) Explore and identify potential linkages and relationships between national policies and adaptation and mitigation strategies. Non-Annex I Parties are increasingly linking the reporting process under the Convention with their overall national development planning processes. The CGE will identify the potential links between national development policies and adaptation and mitigation strategies, which will be used in the training programmes it delivers. Understanding those relationships and linkages will help non-Annex I Parties to integrate and mainstream climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies, as well as reporting activities, into their national development planning processes.

D. Strategy 3: ensure availability of resources and optimal working arrangements for the operations of the Consultative Group of Experts

35. The aim of this strategy is to establish an optimal working arrangement for the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention and to ensure that the required resources are secured in a timely manner.

36. The CGE continues to be mandated as the primary vehicle under the Convention to address the capacity development and technical assistance needs of developing country Parties in fulfilling their reporting requirements. To fulfil its mandate and be able to carry out possible new emerging tasks, it is vital for the CGE to have financial resources that are predictable, available in a timely manner and in line with its evolving mandate. It is also vital that there are sufficient human resources available within the secretariat, which is a key partner of the CGE in delivering its mandate.

37. To implement this strategy, the CGE will:

(a) Review current working arrangements and their limitations: such a review will give the group a better understanding of its operating mode and its capacity to fulfil its mandate, including its capacity gaps and needs;

(b) Develop working arrangements, including intersessional working arrangements, to fulfil its long-term strategy: on the basis of the review, the working arrangements will be revised and improved to maximize the efficiency of the CGE, particularly its capacity to work between sessions. The option of using video conferencing tools to advance intersessional work should be explored;

(c) Develop and revise its annual workplans: the CGE will continue to prepare annual workplans, including a programme of activities. It will also assess the human and financial resources needed to execute its workplans and draw up performance monitoring indicators to measure how well it is progressing with the implementation of each annual workplan. Such an exercise should be carried out as early as possible in the year concerned or at the last meeting of the preceding year. It should also take into consideration the secretariat's budget cycle;

(d) Promote the strategy and annual workplans to potential donors in order to secure multi-year funding of the CGE action plans: the programme of action of the CGE

should be regularly promoted to potential donors in order to secure the necessary financial resources in a timely manner;

(e) Collaborate and cooperate with other multilateral initiatives: from the perspective of resource efficiency, the CGE will enhance its coordination with other multilateral initiatives and agencies, such as the GEF-funded UNDP/UNEP GSP for the preparation of NCs and BURs and relevant initiatives undertaken by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR);

(f) Report on progress annually: progress reports will be compiled at the end of each year using the performance monitoring indicators identified in each annual workplan. The reports, including the workplan for the forthcoming year and resource requirements, will be submitted to the SBI for its consideration.

E. Strategy 4: enhance collaboration and cooperation with other global initiatives

38. The aim of this strategy is to enhance the collaboration and cooperation of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE) with other global initiatives, with a view to exploring synergies and expanding the outreach of the CGE.

39. In the context of fulfilling its mandate, the CGE needs to find effective and efficient mechanisms to expand its reach to non-Annex I Parties. In addition to a more conventional way of communicating with its stakeholders, the CGE will expand its collaboration and cooperation with global initiatives, including other expert groups and constituted bodies under the Convention, United Nations agencies, multilateral programmes, international non-governmental entities, the research community and academia involved in climate change activities. In addition, there are additional expert groups and other constituted bodies under the Convention that are mandated, among other things, to contribute to the capacity-building of non-Annex I Parties within the areas addressed by them.

40. To implement this strategy, the CGE will:

(a) Identify possibilities for and develop collaboration and cooperation with other expert groups and constituted bodies under the Convention: under the existing arrangements, there are additional expert groups and other constituted bodies under the Convention, such as the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, the Adaptation Committee, the Technology Executive Committee, the Climate Technology Centre and Network and the Standing Committee on Finance, which are involved in, among other things, the capacity-building of non-Annex I Parties within their mandated areas. Among most of the areas of capacity-building addressed by the bodies there is an element of overlap, in particular those relating to assessments and reporting, and hence the CGE will make every effort to collaborate and cooperate with the bodies to ensure coherency and avoid duplication;

(b) Identify possibilities for and develop collaboration and cooperation with key global initiatives: from the perspective of resource efficiency, the CGE will enhance its coordination and collaboration with multilateral initiatives and agencies, such as GEF agencies, particularly the GEF-funded UNDP/UNEP GSP for the preparation of NCs and BURs, and United Nations agencies, including UNITAR, which seeks to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations through appropriate training and research. The CGE will also develop its collaboration and cooperation with international non-governmental organizations, the research community and academia involved in climate change activities.

F. Strategy 5: enhance communication and outreach

41. The aim of this strategy is to enhance the communication and outreach initiatives of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention in order to facilitate constant interaction with and a good flow of information between key stakeholders, including Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention.

42. In order to improve its long-term stability and overall effectiveness, the CGE will enhance its communication and outreach programmes so as to better interact with key stakeholders. It is not necessary to 'reinvent the wheel' constantly: ample means already exist by which the CGE and developing countries can exchange knowledge on challenges, lessons learned and best practices, ranging from online platforms to personal exchanges during regional and international workshops and training seminars. Communication and outreach can also be enhanced through South–South cooperation, which connects stakeholders with varying levels of expertise and shared languages via joint learning.

43. To implement this strategy, the CGE will:

(a) Identify global networks with which the CGE can collaborate to enhance effective and efficient interaction with stakeholders in non-Annex I Parties: a review conducted by NCSP indicated that there are existing mechanisms and networks whereby non-Annex I Parties collaborate for the development of their NCs. The CGE will identify such global mechanisms and networks and assess their potential as a tool to enhance communication and outreach between the CGE and its stakeholders;

(b) Develop communication products targeting experts and the aforementioned global networks in non-Annex I Parties: as part of supporting the development of national capacities, the CGE will develop communication products, such as newsletters and a platform to disseminate 'quick-win' ideas and information on NCs and BURs, targeting national experts;

(c) Provide and use an existing web-based platform for accessing information and guidance on the preparation of NCs and BURs: such a mechanism will provide more information and guidance to stakeholders;

(d) Develop a web platform for CGE members to collaborate between sessions and meetings: through such a mechanism, CGE members will be able to communicate and exchange information and contribute more effectively to the work of the CGE, particularly between sessions and meetings;

(e) Enhance interaction between the CGE members and their constituencies: the CGE members will create an informal network of experts and practitioners involved in the process of and preparation of NCs, by region, which will serve as a vehicle for the dissemination of relevant information from the CGE to stakeholders and which could also be used by non-Annex I Parties to seek technical advice and support from the CGE. This will allow the CGE to extend its outreach to stakeholders in a targeted manner by taking into account regional circumstances;

(f) Enhance the remote participation of the CGE in relevant events: the CGE will enhance its use of low-cost online tools and approaches, such as webinars and remote participation via video conferencing tools, for participating in relevant events hosted outside of the UNFCCC process to present its work or serve as an information resource.

V. Implementation – going forward

44. The long-term strategy of the CGE for 2015–2018 incorporates the mandate of the CGE set out in its revised terms of reference. The strategy, along with the broad work programme of the CGE for 2014–2018, will become the main guiding document for the work of the CGE in the period 2015–2018.

45. The strategies defined in this document will be operationalized through the annual work programmes of the CGE, starting with the work programme of the CGE for 2015.

46. At the first meeting of the year, the CGE, as it revises and updates its annual work programme, will identify activities and corresponding targets under each of the five strategies for the year. A template to be used to identify and capture the outcomes of such an exercise is provided in the annex. This will allow the CGE to implement its work as well as assess the progress of its implementation in an objective manner.

Annex

Template for the annual work programme of the Consultative Group of Experts

Vision	*Goals*	*Strategies*	*Year X*	
			Activities	*Targets*
Mandated by the Conference of the Parties (COP), the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE) works towards providing technical support and advice in an effective, adequate and sustainable manner that significantly contributes to Parties' efforts in implementing a measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) framework under the Convention for developing country Parties	(a) To support developing country Parties in fulfilling their reporting requirements under the Convention on a continuous basis by building their national capacities for the process of and preparation of national communications (NCs) and biennial update reports (BURs)	Strategy 1: build the capacity of developing country Parties to facilitate the implementation of MRV arrangements under the Convention	•	•
		Strategy 2: enhance the sustainability of the NC and BUR process	•	•
		Strategy 3: ensure availability of resources and optimal working arrangements for the operations of the CGE	•	•
	(b) To establish an environment for the CGE that enables it to continue providing technical assistance, support and advice mandated by the COP in an effective, adequate and sustainable manner, taking into consideration the challenges that it faces and potential new tasks that may be assigned to it by the COP	Strategy 4: enhance collaboration and cooperation with global initiatives	•	•
		Strategy 5: enhance communication and outreach	•	•

United Nations

FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.16

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
15 October 2014

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Forty-first session
Lima, 1–8 December 2014

Item 4(b) of the provisional agenda
Reporting from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention
Work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention

Progress report on the work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention: technical report on problems and constraints, as well as lessons learned and best practices, in the process of and the preparation of national communications and biennial update reports by Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention

Note by the secretariat

Summary

This report outlines the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices identified in the process of and the preparation of national communications by Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties). It has been prepared by compiling and synthesizing information from various sources provided by non-Annex I Parties on the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices relating to the process of and the preparation of national communications and biennial update reports. This report will inform the work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention on the identification and provision of technical assistance for non-Annex I Parties, and will also serve as a source of lessons learned and best practices for non-Annex I Parties.

GE.14-18750 (E)

1418750

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–7	3
	A. Mandate	1–2	3
	B. Scope of the note	3–6	3
	C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	7	4
II.	Summary of the steps taken to compile and synthesize the information	8–10	4
III.	Results of the compilation and synthesis	11–80	4
	A. Institutional arrangements	12–31	5
	B. National greenhouse gas inventories	32–49	7
	C. Vulnerability and adaptation assessments	50–61	10
	D. Mitigation assessments	62–68	11
	E. Cross-cutting issues	69–80	12

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP), by decision 19/CP.19, continued the mandate of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE) for a period of five years, from 2014 to 2018.[1]

2. The COP also decided that the CGE, in fulfilling its mandate, shall continue to provide technical advice and support to Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties) to improve the process of and the preparation of national communications (NCs) and biennial update reports (BURs). The CGE shall, among other things:

(a) Identify and provide technical assistance regarding problems and constraints that have affected the process of and the preparation of NCs and BURs by non-Annex I Parties;[2]

(b) Provide information and technical advice based on, where possible, lessons learned and best practices in the process of and the preparation of NCs and BURs by non-Annex I Parties, including in relation to finance and other support available.[3]

B. Scope of the note

3. The CGE, in response to the above mandate, agreed to prepare, as a part of its work programme for 2014,[4] a technical report compiling and synthesizing the available information on the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices in the process of and the preparation of NCs and BURs by non-Annex I Parties.

4. Further, the CGE also agreed to conduct a survey to gather more up-to-date feedback from non-Annex I Parties, as well as from multilateral agencies involved in the process of and the preparation of NCs and/or BURs, that would complement the compiled and synthesized information.

5. Currently, non-Annex I Parties have limited experience in the preparation of BURs. However, owing to a significant overlap between the themes covered by both NCs and BURs, it is logical to assume that many of the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices in the process of and the preparation of NCs will also be applicable to the process of and the preparation of BURs. This has been substantiated by the results of the survey referred to in paragraph 4 above, where a number of respondents indicated that this was the case.

6. This technical report is a compilation and synthesis of the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices in the process of and the preparation of NCs and BURs. The information contained in this report has been obtained from, among others:

[1] Decision 19/CP.19, paragraph 1.
[2] Decision 19/CP.19, annex, paragraph 2(a).
[3] Decision 19/CP.19, annex, paragraph 2(g).
[4] See <http://unfccc.int/2608.php>

(a) Reports by the National Communications Support Programme (NCSP), which was jointly implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP);[5]

(b) Past CGE survey reports;[6]

(c) Recent NCs from non-Annex I Parties;[7]

(d) The survey conducted by the CGE in 2014 on problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices in the process of and the preparation of NCs and BURs;

(e) The report on the two regional training workshops on the preparation of BURs from non-Annex I Parties, which contains some elements relating to problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices in the process of and the preparation of BURs.[8] These elements reflect only the views of the workshop participants.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

7. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation, having considered this report, may wish to provide further guidance to the CGE, as appropriate, on the provision of technical assistance and support to non-Annex I Parties in the process of and the preparation of NCs and BURs.

II. Summary of the steps taken to compile and synthesize the information

8. Between January and April 2014, the CGE compiled and synthesized existing information on the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices in the process of and the preparation of NCs by non-Annex I Parties.

9. With a view to complementing the compiled and synthesized information with more up-to-date feedback, the CGE conducted an online survey, from 15 April to 15 May 2014, focused on the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices in the process of and the preparation of NCs and BURs by non-Annex I Parties.

10. By 15 May 2014, a total of 92 respondents from 72 non-Annex I Parties and two multilateral agencies involved in initiatives to support the process of and the preparation of NCs and BURs had participated in the survey. The respondents consisted of national focal points, NC and BUR project coordinators, as well as multilateral agency representatives (UNDP and UNEP). Of the 72 non-Annex I Parties represented, 32 respondents were from the African region; 25 from the Asia-Pacific region; 20 from the Latin American and Caribbean region; and 11 from the Eastern European region.

III. Results of the compilation and synthesis

11. The following section of the report contains the results of the compilation and synthesis, with a focus on the following areas: institutional arrangements; national greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories; vulnerability and adaptation assessments; mitigation

[5] See <http://ncsp.undp.org/sites/default/files/Country%20papers%20Final%20Version_1.pdf> and <http://ncsp.undp.org/sites/default/files/National%20Communications_Lessons%20Learned.pdf>

[6] FCCC/SBI/2011/5/Add.2 and FCCC/SBI/2011/10/Add.1

[7] See <http://unfccc.int/national_reports/non-annex_i_natcom/items/2979.php>

[8] FCCC/SBI/2014/18

assessments; and cross-cutting issues, such as the provision of financial and technical support.

A. Institutional arrangements

12. This section describes the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices relating to institutional arrangements for managing the process of and the preparation of NCs and BURs.

1. Problems and constraints[9]

13. The structure and affiliation of government institutions related to climate change are subject to frequent changes. National experts vacate their posts for a variety of reasons and the knowledge and technical capacity of their replacement is frequently inadequate. This creates a capacity issue, as the experts vacating their posts are, in most cases, the only expert in their field. Additionally, the departure of these experts usually leads to a loss of established data collection networks.

14. Inadequate specific legislative and/or policy support for climate change initiatives usually results in an insufficient institutional basis for the preparation of NCs and BURs. Consequently, the responsible institution is unable to justify the resource commitment for the preparation and submission of NCs and BURs. Further, a lack of legislation renders the process of data collection from the private sector extremely challenging, especially in cases where data collection and storage involve costs.

15. Public institutions usually have an insufficient number of qualified personnel possessing the technical knowledge required to undertake technical studies and an understanding of the methodologies used for the preparation of NCs. Training workshops organized with the aim of addressing this issue are sometimes ineffective, as most attendees lack the background needed to fully benefit from the knowledge delivered.

16. In most cases, consultants were contracted to prepare the initial NCs, with experts from responsible ministries primarily involved in facilitating and completing this work. Consequently, the staff from the responsible ministries failed to benefit from the capacity-building associated with undertaking the process of preparing and submitting the NC.

2. Lessons learned[10]

17. As a way of increasing awareness on climate change and its impacts, and of improving the countries' ability to assess their national vulnerability, Parties are involving experts from governmental institutions, research institutions, universities, the private sector, civil society organizations, women and indigenous groups, the general public and municipalities. The involvement of these bodies has the potential to ensure that the preparation of NCs is a continuous process and enhances long-term data sharing at the national, local, government and private-sector levels. It is also perceived as a way of building capacity at all levels for the preparation of future national reports.

18. Through the scope of the NCs, non-Annex I Parties have realized that climate change is no longer an issue that can be delegated to one ministry or a few institutions; rather, it is a matter to be taken up by Prime Ministers and Presidents and their respective administrations.

[9] In this report, all problems and constraints were identified by non-Annex I Parties themselves.

[10] In this report, all lessons learned were identified by non-Annex I Parties themselves and refer to observations made during the process of and/or the preparation of NCs and/or BURs. They could have a positive, negative or neutral effect.

19. Collaboration with NCSP was positively viewed by Parties as a way of improving the presentation, sequence and relevance of the information in NCs. This collaboration was also useful in evaluating the level of uncertainty of the information generated by consultants and in enhancing domestic capacity for the preparation of future reports. Additionally, NCSP has provided guidance on the level of information required and on how local institutions could be organized to improve their preparation for subsequent NCs.

20. Some non-Annex I Parties are establishing national climate change committees comprised of technical experts from multiple government departments. The committee members are expected to be familiar with the objectives of the Convention and the obligations of Parties, and are responsible for coordinating climate change initiatives within relevant ministries and helping to facilitate the process of preparing NCs. This approach is expected to ensure that government data sources are readily available for the preparation of national reports. Further, some non-Annex I Parties are establishing connections with ongoing national climate change activities, including projects on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD).

21. Some non-Annex I Parties are reviewing and aligning national policies, strategies, plans and programmes with emerging issues, particularly in the context of the environment and climate change. Institutional frameworks are being strengthened and made relevant to readily address the risks posed by climate change with regard to social and economic development.

22. With respect to BURs and subsequent NCs, some Parties have decided to build capacity in order to cope with the enhanced reporting requirements in the UNFCCC process by transferring tasks previously performed by consultants to governmental institutions. Parties also view this approach as a means of retaining institutional memory, especially when implemented in conjunction with an information-sharing goal.

23. In addition to workshops and training seminars, non-Annex I Parties are establishing national professional networks and networks with experts from other countries in order to facilitate the exchange of information and data needed for the various sections of national reports.

24. Some non-Annex I Parties are tailoring the relevant Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) guidelines and guidance documents to their specific national circumstances and are training sectoral experts responsible for preparing NCs members to use these tailored guidelines and guidance documents to meet reporting requirements.

3. Best practices[11]

25. National experts have benefited from working with regional experts, especially when they speak the same language. Non-Annex I Parties have found that, as a result, the quality of NCs has been enhanced as the NC team draws from the experience of regional experts, who may have encountered and resolved similar issues while working in countries from the same region.

26. Careful selection of the national reporting team, as well as the profiling of its members, is useful from the start. Where possible, the potential replacements of team members should be identified from the outset and gradually introduced to the process. Some non-Annex I Parties have found that having a team that embraces new members and comprises at least 10 members increases the likelihood of the successful preparation of the NC. However, the team should be structured into core and non-core members. This

[11] In this report, all best practices were identified by non-Annex I Parties themselves and refer to any lessons learned and implemented over a period of time that have resulted in an observable improvement in the process and/or product.

approach will also help to retain institutional memory and increase familiarity with the limitations, obstacles and challenges in, as well as the solutions for, the development of future national reports.

27. The establishment of memoranda of understanding with data providers from the public and private sectors, as well as their involvement in the national reporting initiatives, has been beneficial to the collection and processing of data, which in turn has improved reliability, fostered national ownership and increased national confidence in the results of NCs. Some non-Annex I Parties, in establishing memoranda of understanding, assured the private sector that the information provided will not be used, for example, to increase taxes, but strictly for the purposes of preparing NCs and BURs.

28. Some non-Annex I Parties have found it beneficial to establish an expert group for each thematic area of the NC, with a coordinator who reports to the NC project manager and presents regular updates to a national steering committee. The expert group coordinator ensures that the content of the thematic area is consistent with the relevant sections of the national reporting guidelines and delivered within agreed timelines.

29. Attendance at training workshops has helped both consultants and government officials in the preparation of NCs by enhancing their respective capacity to complete the reporting process and to initiate the creation and institutionalization of the NC process by ensuring the sustained availability of expertise in all sectors.

30. A few non-Annex I Parties have noted several positive impacts of establishing a national inventory system, including improved institutional arrangements, the development of a GHG database, the establishment of reviewing processes and the development of quality control/quality assurance measures.

31. One non-Annex I Party found it a good practice to contract a non-governmental organization for the publication of quarterly newsletters on activities for the preparation of NCs. This was seen as a cost-effective tool that largely contributed to the effective communication of climate change issues to a wide audience. It was highly appreciated by national partners and has been referenced at various events.

B. National greenhouse gas inventories

32. This section describes the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices relating to national GHG inventories with regard to the process of and the preparation of NCs and BURs.

1. Problems and constraints

33. In most cases, relevant data providers do not conduct data collection with the preparation of national GHG inventories as the primary objective. Consequently, the format of the data collected may not be suitable for national GHG inventory purposes, or the data may be incomplete. Some of the specific data collection problems identified by non-Annex I Parties include:

(a) Highly aggregated data which are unsuitable for the preparation of a national GHG inventory consistent with the IPCC guidelines;

(b) Inadequate data management systems for national GHG inventories, thereby rendering the process of data archiving and use challenging. In most cases, data providers do not have the capacity to archive the data over a period of several years and tend to lose track of the archived data. Also, the data are archived in specific formats, including in 'soft'

and/or 'hard' copy, and in multiple locations across different agencies, leading to difficulties in obtaining and using the data;

(e) Data collection processes frequently lack formal arrangements and the data are often provided without sufficient metadata, thereby rendering the data unverifiable.

34. Where they are not satisfied with the default emission factors (EFs) and/or other EFs contained in the IPCC EF database, non-Annex I Parties are faced with the challenge of developing country-specific EFs. While these should reduce uncertainty and increase the accuracy of national GHG inventories, non-Annex I Parties lack the expertise and resources to facilitate their development.

35. Parties with ineffective institutional arrangements tend to conduct activity data collection on an on-demand basis with no obligation on the part of the data generators to periodically collect and submit complete data to the NC team or to a designated national GHG emission data coordination centre. Some companies are prepared to use litigation to avoid sharing data for the preparation of national reports.

36. Some non-Annex I Parties are unable to perform a meaningful comparison of national GHG inventories or produce sectoral emissions trends owing to the use of different guidelines over time: they are using the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* for the preparation of sections of or the entire national GHG inventory in place of the *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, used in previous years.

2. Lessons learned

37. Some non-Annex I Parties are taking advantage of the work completed for other projects related to the UNFCCC process. For example, country-specific EFs and methodologies developed for sustainable transport, energy efficiency and biomass projects, mostly funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), are being used in the preparation of national GHG inventories.

38. Better statistical sampling and additional measurements are perceived by non-Annex I Parties as a way of improving the quality of country-specific EFs. Industry associations are being engaged in the development of country-specific EFs in some non-Annex I Parties. Several Parties have set goals to demonstrate that the share of emissions calculated using higher-tier methodologies is increasing from one national report to the next.

39. Updating and revising the details and assumptions made in previous NCs has improved the quality of the data available to some non-Annex I Parties for the preparation of their national GHG inventories. The updates and revisions are being performed by consulting recently published information on national economic developments and updated demographic parameters in order to develop more accurate estimates.

40. Non-Annex I Parties are developing various ways of dealing with data-related issues, including by:

(a) Making efforts to raise the awareness of data providers and key stakeholders on data gaps and methods for data collection, as well as by dedicating resources to explore approaches for dealing with data gaps. To address less significant data gaps, and when attempting to make highly aggregated data useful for reporting purposes, some non-Annex I Parties have used extrapolation, averages, downscaling and expert judgment, while surveys and interviews, together with the establishment of memoranda of understanding with relevant institutions to facilitate data sharing, are being used for more significant data gaps. Other non-Annex I Parties have created and shared simple data collection spreadsheets with relevant government departments. This approach has been accompanied

by training courses for professionals working in these sectors in order to harmonize understanding and ensure consistency;

(b) Ensuring the continuous flow of data from national institutions to the NC team, by establishing a national GHG inventory system to collect and organize data according to IPCC national GHG inventory sectors and to disseminate information on GHG emissions. The primary components of these systems are a national registration and reporting platform, indicators and baselines for each sector, and a verification system for assessing uncertainties and quality control;

(c) Advocating for the creation of a legal instrument (e.g. by-law, regulation) that will require the disclosure, on a continuous basis, of activity data by major GHG emitters to the ministry responsible for the environment. A few non-Annex I Parties have established national and sectoral focal points for data management and have created methods for improving data sharing among institutions. The sectoral focal points are also responsible for regularly monitoring and performing consistency checks on the collected data, which is expected to reduce inconsistency among data sets;

(d) Documenting the steps involved in the data collection process and annotating the collected data to help retain institutional memory and serve as the basis for a larger data depository.

41. Some non-Annex I Parties are using intra-team peer reviews for quality assurance. For example, the contribution of the team preparing the information on the agriculture sector is reviewed by the team preparing the information on the energy sector, and the contribution of the land use, land-use change and forestry team is reviewed by the agriculture team, whose results are in turn reviewed by the waste team, and so on. These intra-team peer reviews are included as one of the tasks in each team member's terms of reference.

42. Some non-Annex I Parties recommend a system with a minimum of two experts per sector: one responsible for entering the activity data and EFs, with the other responsible for checking them and either validating or confirming the need to perform a recalculation. The recalculation, when needed, is performed by both experts to ensure that the final results accurately reflect the national GHG inventory for that sector.

3. Best practices

43. Regional capacity-building GHG inventory workshops on improved reporting tools conducted by the UNFCCC have reportedly enhanced the capacity of existing national experts, and also increased the pool of experts within a range of national institutions.

44. To address gaps in activity data, some non-Annex I Parties have prepared a summary report which identifies the gaps and a template to guide national institutions in the collection of data, which have proved to be effective. By sharing these documents with the institutions concerned, some NC teams have obtained good quality data which have been complete and sufficiently detailed to enable the application of an IPCC tier 2 methodology in some subsectors. This has yielded good results in cases where companies have the required activity data but do not want to share them because they are not required to do so.

45. A few non-Annex I Parties have found it a good practice to use the Monte Carlo simulation (IPCC tier 2 methodology) to conduct the uncertainty assessment for the key categories.

46. To deal with highly aggregated activity data, some non-Annex I Parties have used and reported positive results when filtering one type of information from another, and/or when creating coefficients (based on expert judgment) that can be used to split aggregated information into different values. Though time-consuming and labour-intensive, teams

which have factored in time for such work during the planning phase have found it to be beneficial.

47. Some non-Annex I Parties have found that organizing sectoral meetings on the topic of information gathering, in which activity data and EFs were regularly discussed, is a valuable exercise. Parties recommend that these activities should be carried out in association with a centralized information system for all relevant data generated during the inventory process to allow for a constant comparative assessment.

48. For a better understanding of national GHG inventory results, some non-Annex I Parties suggest providing documentation on, among other things, activity data and the underlying assumptions used, including the rationale for their use. Some Parties also recommend providing information in the national GHG inventory report on the methodological approaches used and steps taken, as well as on the sources of information on which the analysis is based.

49. Some national experts have addressed the issue of transfer of experience and knowledge to future national teams by creating a national GHG inventory reference manual and accompanying Excel worksheets that answer the recurrent questions encountered during the national GHG inventory development process. The reference manual provides information on how to approach the various tasks involved in preparing a national GHG inventory. It covers, inter alia, activities by sector and identifies institutions that host nationally relevant data.

C. Vulnerability and adaptation assessments

50. This section describes the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices with regard to conducting vulnerability and adaptation assessments.

1. Problems and constraints

51. Some non-Annex I Parties reported that existing training workshops on climate modelling or vulnerability and adaptation assessments are of insufficient duration to be effective at ensuring that the knowledge of designated national participants is at the level required to conduct a full climate modelling or vulnerability and adaptation assessmen. exercise.

52. Some non-Annex I Parties also reported a lack of sufficient baseline time series for the stream flow rate, climate conditions and calibration of other impact models.

53. Several non-Annex I Parties reported that existing funds are insufficient to carry out technical studies that would cover all the prioritized socioeconomic sectors.

2. Lessons learned

54. Some non-Annex I Parties are including case studies on sectors of interest to the national economy in the vulnerability and adaptation section of their NCs. These have mostly included health, water resources, agriculture and coastal zones. Several non-Annex I Parties are also exploring the possibility of using the preparation of NCs as an opportunity for the integration of climate change responses into water, energy, agriculture, health, education, social and environmental policies.

55. Some governments have developed a policy to provide the basis for nationally led adaptation planning initiatives and recognized the need to mainstream adaptation into national planning processes. The institutions involved and their work are being used for the preparation of the vulnerability and adaptation section of NCs.

56. A number of non-Annex I Parties are prioritizing areas with a history of natural disasters, especially those with high population density and tourism activity, for a more detailed analysis, and are including these as an additional feature of the vulnerability and adaptation section of the NC. Some non-Annex I Parties have also elaborated vulnerability and adaptation assessments for the health sector, including an analysis of the correlation between natural phenomena and the occurrence of disease, with the hope that it will ultimately help to inform future plans to combat disease.

57. As a solution to data scarcity issues (e.g. in the residential subsector, which is relevant for complementing the information on vulnerability and adaptation assessments), some national teams are using first-hand information gathered from communities through face-to-face interviews with residents, as well as surveys.

58. Models developed and estimates made for previous NCs are being relied on and simply amended for future NCs by some countries.

3. Best practices

59. A few non-Annex I Parties have tailored the selected methodological framework to the requirements of the vulnerability and adaptation assessments, ensuring that it is suited to the national technical capacity, available data, time constraints and resources.

60. Some non-Annex I Parties are using PRECIS,[12] a regional climate model, to improve the accuracy of projections of climate change scenarios while paying particular attention to seasons with more frequent disaster occurrence. This process was found to improve institutional capacity for informed decision-making. Such non-Annex I Parties report that when better-quality and more detailed information is used in this model, more relevant recommendations are provided for adaptation options.

61. Several non-Annex I Parties' vulnerability and adaptation assessments have explored the connections between adaptation and mitigation actions, and have successfully mainstreamed mitigation actions throughout many aspects of the economy. For example, a number of non-Annex I Parties have analysed specific sectors, such as the agriculture sector, in terms of how the measures that support adaptation to climate change can, at the same time, result in emission reductions.

D. Mitigation assessments

62. This section describes the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices with regard to conducting and reporting mitigation assessments.

1. Problems and constraints

63. Conducting mitigation assessments requires quality baseline information, which serves as a reference for the progress made in the implementation of resulting actions. Current data challenges and high uncertainties associated with national GHG inventories in some non-Annex I Parties constitute a constraint when assessing the effectiveness of implemented actions.

64. Some mitigation options can be politically sensitive or may result in negative social and/or economic consequences and may conflict with immediate government priorities in some developing countries.

[12] Providing REgional Climates for Impacts Studies.

2. Lessons learned

65. Some non-Annex I Parties are strengthening coordination activities with relevant ministries and other stakeholders at different levels to facilitate the two-way flow of information, thereby ensuring that the relevant policies and measures of each ministry are incorporated into the mitigation section of the national reports.

66. A number of non-Annex I Parties are formulating, implementing, publicizing and regularly updating national and, where appropriate, regional programmes containing measures to reduce GHG emissions. Others are focusing abatement analyses on both the identification of current and future mitigation options.

67. Some non-Annex I Parties are allocating time to regularly review and update proposed abatement options for each sector to reflect new developments and needs. When considering new mitigation technologies and options, some non-Annex I Parties are focusing on key emission sources identified through the key category analysis and updated as part of the national GHG inventory exercise.

3. Best practices

68. Some non-Annex I Parties find the outcomes of mitigation assessments to be more comprehensive when they include:

(a) Information on the sector; the cost of implementation; a description of the action; the economic, social and environmental effects; and any perceived constraints. Some non-Annex I Parties have implemented mitigation measures not only as a means of reducing GHG emissions, but also as a way of taking advantage of collateral benefits. The politically, socially and economically sensitive nature of some mitigation measures requires innovative approaches that guarantee benefits beyond GHG emission reductions, in order for them to appear more appealing to policymakers. Sectors with the highest mitigation potential should be prioritized when presenting the information in national reports;

(b) Specific recommendations for mitigation programmes and information on when approaches which could attract investment under the clean development mechanism are used. Parties recommend providing detailed information on the expected GHG emission reductions estimated against the baseline GHG emissions.

E. Cross-cutting issues

69. This section describes the problems and constraints, lessons learned and best practices with regard to elements that are relevant to most, or all, of the themes covered in chapter III(A–D).

1. Problems and constraints

70. The procedure for accessing funds available from the GEF is perceived by some non-Annex I Parties as complex, and includes a lengthy communication process between the Party, the relevant GEF agency and the GEF.

71. Maintaining the quality of the technical processes involved and the information generated is a primary concern for non-Annex I Parties preparing their NCs. For some non-Annex I Parties, the preparation of NCs has involved conducting, for the first time, a comprehensive stocktaking of climate change relevant information at the national level, which generates a large amount of information. Aside from information that is directly required for NCs, national GHG inventories and vulnerability and adaptation and mitigation assessments, there is also a need for reliable socioeconomic information, particularly for the

establishment of scenarios for vulnerability and adaptation and mitigation assessments. While this is viewed by most non-Annex I Parties as a positive exercise, the task of structuring and analysing this information into the main technical components of NCs is, in most cases, a challenge.

72. When global or regional models are used, for example in the construction of scenarios, procedures for downscaling to appropriate levels require expertise which is frequently not available. In cases where experts are available, they are often few in number and involved in several other task forces and stakeholder groups.

2. Lessons learned

73. Increasingly, some developing countries are recognizing that the benefits of conducting national GHG inventories and vulnerability and adaptation and mitigation assessments go beyond fulfilling the reporting requirements under the Convention. Non-Annex I Parties are reporting the use of information from NCs in national planning, international climate negotiations, and the mobilization of financing for climate change and development activities.

74. Non-Annex I Parties are finding that meeting national climate change reporting requirements can be a challenge for both governmental and non-governmental institutions. They require a great amount of interdisciplinary knowledge and communication between institutions, something which is not always easily attained within the traditional ministerial framework, given that each ministry is usually responsible for a specific sector. Increasingly, non-Annex I Parties are recognizing that the issue of climate change presents an opportunity to work in a more integrated manner and that institutional capacity can be improved through active involvement in the UNFCCC process.

75. Some non-Annex I Parties are performing a short assessment at the beginning of the process of preparing national reports to help them to prioritize training activities and focus resources where they are most needed.

76. To deal with limited capacity at the national level, some non-Annex I Parties are establishing partnerships with regional expert groups that are able to provide the required technical expertise, which in most cases is more cost-efficient. Also, when engaging consultants, non-Annex I Parties are prioritizing regional experts with a good understanding of their national circumstances and familiarity with some of the issues common to countries in their region.

77. Some non-Annex I Parties are using the impacts of climate change on health and the national economy to persuade data generators to provide data for national reporting activities. Additionally, some have also established ongoing national campaigns to emphasize the usefulness of data collection in the correct format.

3. Best practices

78. Non-Annex I Parties are reporting that language-related issues constitute an important part of the UNFCCC process and affect, among other things, training workshops, guidance materials and overall communication with support initiatives. To address these issues, some Parties have:

(a) Invested, where possible, in making technical resources available in national languages to facilitate the process;

(b) Established working relationships with Parties with the same official language, resulting in the provision of training, peer reviews, peer assistance, data sharing, where possible, the exchanging of information on best practices and conducting joint training workshops;

(c) Developed a regional approach to using the PRECIS modelling system, which consists of an agreement to conduct various experiments and share the results with other Parties.

79. Non-Annex I Parties underlined the importance of incorporating quality assurance activities from the start of the process in order to ensure that quality issues are identified in a timely manner and resolved. Most non-Annex I Parties have established a process to review and improve the quality of national reports prior to submission, including by using both international and domestic third-party reviewers.

80. Some non-Annex I Parties have a system to ensure that NC results are communicated back to the relevant agencies and that completed national reports are accompanied by policy papers for high-level decision makers.